DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 536 JC 850 320

AUTHOR Lee, Beth S.
TITLE Measures of Progress: Spring 1984 Student Follow-Up.
INSTITUTION Los Rios Community Coll. District, Sacramento, Calif.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 62p.; Survey instrument contains small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Graduates; College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Dropout Characteristics; *Dropouts; Employment Patterns; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; *Outcomes of Education; Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

In spring 1984, the Los Rios Community College District conducted a survey of 4,280 former students who had attended one of the district's three colleges in fall 1982 or spring 1983. The study sought information on the former students' characteristics, primary educational goals, major programs of study, employment/educational status, and reasons for not re-enrolling at a district college. The survey population included all students who received an associate degree or certificate of achievement, as well as nongraduate/nonreturning students. Study findings, based on an adjusted response rate of 51.6%, included the following: (1) 63% of the general education graduates (GE Grads), 54% of the nonreturning students (NRSs), and 50% of the occupational education graduates (OE Grads) were female; (2) GE Grads were the youngest group; (3) almost 69% of the GE Grads had attended the community college primarily to earn university transfer credit, while 85% of the OE Grads attended to prepare for a new job or upgrade job skills, and 75% of the NRSs attended for job-related reasons; (4) 69% of the GE Grads were enrolled at a college or university and 61% were employed at the time of the survey; and (5) the respondents' primary reason for not re-enrolling at a district college was that they had completed the program or courses they desired. The survey instrument and cover letter is included. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257536

Measures of Progress:

Spring 1984
Student Follow-up

Beth S. Lee, Ed.D.
Faculty Research Associate
May, 1985

Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court, Sacramento, CA 95825

JC 850 320

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

BETH S. LEE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE

MEASURES OF PROGRESS:
SPRING 1984 STUDENT FOLLOW-UP
LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Beth S. Lee, Ed.D.
Faculty Research Associate
Office of Planning and Research

Los Rios Community College District

May 1985

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Sacramento City College 1916 — American River College 1955 — Cosumnes River College 1970

DAVID MERTES
Chancellor/Superintendent

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
Spring 1984

Executive Summary

In Spring 1984 the Los Rios Community College District conducted a survey of 4,280 former students who had attended one of the district's three colleges (American River, Cosumnes River, or Sacramento City) in Fall 1982 or Spring 1983. The survey population included all those who had received an associate degree or certificate of achievement, plus nongraduate/nonreturning students for whom follow-up is required for Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) reports. A total of 2,042 responses were received, for an adjusted response rate of 51.6% (VEDS graduates, 57.3%; VEDS nongraduates, 44.2%; non-VEDS graduates, 55.6%).

The survey included questions regarding the former students' educational and career goals, employment and educational status, and perceptions of the programs and services offered by the colleges.

Results are reported for three groups of respondents:

- *General Education Graduates (referred to as GE GRADs)* – those who received associate degrees in general education or liberal arts majors (662 respondents, or 32.4% of the total);
- *Occupational Education Graduates/Certificate Earners (OE GRADs)* – those who completed a major program considered "occupational" for VEDS reporting (701 respondents, or 34.3%);
- *Nonreturning Students (NRSs)* – those who completed a course designated as "advanced occupational" but received no formal award (679, or 33.3% of the total).

Demographic profiles reveal marked differences among these three groups:

- The GE GRADs had the largest percentage of females (63%), while 54% of the NRSs were female; the OE GRADs were almost evenly divided as to gender.
- The GE GRADs were also the youngest of the responding groups; their median age was 24.4 years, as compared to 28.9 for the OE GRADs and 31.5 years for the NRSs.
- Differences among the three groups were less pronounced with respect to ethnicity. The proportions of whites varied only 3% among the groups, from 75% among GE GRADs to 78% of NRSs. Asians comprised the largest minority group in each category, and their proportion was higher among the GE GRADs than in the other two groups. The proportion of blacks was also slightly higher among the GE GRADs, but other ethnic breakdowns varied no more than 1%.

Responses to questions concerning primary educational goals, major programs of study, and employment/educational status also showed distinct contrasts among the three responding groups:

Of the *GE GRADs*,

- Almost 69% had attended the community college primarily to earn university transfer credit, and 69% of them were enrolled in a college or university at the time of the survey. Almost 90% of those attending were at a four-year university, more than 7% were at a California community college, and nearly 3% had transferred out of state. More than 73% were full-time students.

- More than 75% had completed 60 or more units at the college conducting the survey; at the transfer school, almost 69% were classified as juniors and 27% were senior or graduate students.

- At the community college, almost 38% had majored in general education or liberal arts, 25% in business, and 15% in math or the physical sciences. At the transfer college, 26% were in business and 17% in social/behavioral sciences; 8% were still undecided as to their major.

- Only 23% had attended the community college for job-related reasons (improvement of job skills/preparation for a new job). While 61% were employed at the time of this survey, 44% were working part-time (fewer than 35 hours per week) and 66% were employed in a field not related to their community college major. More than 29% were not employed and not seeking employment, while 10.2% were actively seeking work. Among those employed, 91% were working in the Sacramento area.

- Those who were employed full time reported an average monthly salary of $1539; when part-time employment is included, the monthly average was $1147. These averages are the lowest of the three responding groups, which is understandable since they averaged fewer hours of work per week, were younger, and were more likely to be employed in a field unrelated to their major.

Among *OE GRADs*,

- Almost 85% had attended the community college primarily to prepare for a new job or to upgrade job skills. At the time of the survey, more than 80% were employed, more than 10% were not employed and not seeking work, and 9.6% were actively seeking employment.

- Of those employed, 78% were working full time. More than 76% were working in a field related to their community college major, whereas only 42% had been employed in that field prior to enrolling. Almost 84% were employed in the Sacramento area. Average monthly salaries reported by this group were $1548 for full-time employment and $1367 for all employment (full- and part-time).

- While only 9% had enrolled in a Los Rios college primarily to acquire university transfer credit, almost 33% were attending college at the time of this survey. Of these, almost 60% were attending a four-year university, nearly 37% were at a California community college, and 3.5% had transferred out of state. Fifty-two percent of all those enrolled were part-time students.

- Almost 70% had completed 60 or more units at the community college; among those who transferred, 55% were juniors and 26% had attained senior or graduate student status.

- At the community college, 36% had earned a degree or certificate in occupational/trade fields, 22% in business, and 14% in allied health. At the transfer school, 23% were majoring in business, 11% in protective/social services, and 9% were still undecided.

Of the responding *NRSs*,

- Almost 75% had attended the community college primarily for job-related reasons, 11% sought university transfer credit and more than 14% had enrolled for personal or other reasons. More than 48% indicated their educational goal required only the completion of selected course(s) rather than a degree or certificate.

- Of the more than 79% who were employed, 88% were working in the Sacramento area; 82% were working full time and 66% were in a field related to their community college major. More than 12% were not employed and not seeking work; only 8.3% were actively seeking employment.

- The average monthly salaries reported by NRSs were $1499 for all employment and $1657 for those employed full time. These are the highest averages reported among the three responding groups, not surprising since the NRSs were older, more often employed full time and in a field related to their major, and more likely to have been employed in the field prior to enrolling, as compared to the other two groups.

- Nearly 29% were attending college at the time of this survey, 52% of these as part-time students. Almost 49% of those attending college had transferred to a four-year university, more than 48% were at a California community college, and almost 3% attended an out-of-state school.

- Almost 25% of those attending college had attained graduate standing at the time of the survey, indicating that many had previously attended college elsewhere and enrolled in Los Rios only to complete specific courses.

- At the community college, 25% had pursued occupational/technical majors; 27% were in business and 9% in protective services. Of those who transferered, 25% were majoring in business, 11% in occupational/technical fields, and 9% were still undecided.

When asked their primary reason for not reenrolling,

- The largest percentage in each responding group indicated they had completed the program or courses they desired (GE GRADs, 66%; OE GRADs, 72%; NRSs, 36%).

- Almost 23% of NRSs and 11% of OE GRADs checked job-related reasons; 19% of GE GRADs checked "transfer to another college."

- Personal/family reasons were cited by 9% of the NRSs but by only 2% of all graduates.

- Reasons over which the colleges might have some degree of control (inadequate course availability, dissatisfaction with instruction and/or course content, grade problems) accounted for less than 5% of total responses.

The three respondent groups were fairly consistent in their ratings of course characteristics, college services, and general satisfaction with their college experience. On a 5-point scale (where 5 = Very Good),

- Quality of instruction, instructor interest, and course content were rated 4.0 or above by all three groups.

- Each group rated library services and learning center/labs 4.0 or above and also gave high ratings to veterans services, health centers, and services for the disabled.

- Almost all course characteristics and college services listed on the questionnaire were rated 3.5 or above, and ratings were fairly consistent among the three responding groups.

- General satisfaction with their college experience was rated 4.0 or above by all groups; among graduates, the rating was 4.3.

- College training in relation to its usefulness in job performance was rated 3.6 or above by each group, and 4.1 by OE GRADs.

- Preparation for continuing education was rated 3.7 by NRSs and approximately 4.0 by the two groups of graduates.

Other highlights:

- Almost 72% of all employed respondents indicated their courses had helped them obtain a job or to perform/advance in their job.

- More than 78% of total respondents indicated their courses would be of direct benefit in their career, and another 19% reported they would be of indirect benefit.

- More than 62% of all respondents, including 58%-62% of graduates, reported they planned to return to the same college to take additional courses at some time in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are due to many people whose contributions of time and effort were an indispensable part of this study.

The survey was conducted under the direction of a steering committee which included the Associate Deans of Occupational Education at the three district colleges: Patricia O'Brien, American River College; Robert Allerton, Cosumnes River College; and Norval Wellsfry, Sacramento City College. The actual survey procedures were handled primarily by each dean's secretary: Peggy McGrath (assisted by Kraig Keehner) at ARC, Susan Burns at CRC, and Dorothy Fauth at SCC. Sharon Puckle and Richard Rasor (ARC) and Nancy Renkiewicz (SCC) were also very helpful, especially with respect to revising the survey questionnaire.

Data analysis was accomplished with the assistance of the District Data Processing staff, directed by Paul Steed. Special thanks go to Pat Finley, who produced the master lists and mailing labels, and to Randy Jones for technical assistance with WordStar and SPSS-X. I would also like to thank Ann Lynch, Grace Tjenalooi, Greg Washington and Peter Tucker for invaluable assistance in the production of this report.

Valued support for the project was provided by Los Rios Chancellor David Mertes and especially by Janis Cox Coffey, Director of Planning and Research.

Finally, very special thanks go to the many former students of Los Rios who took the time to complete a rather lengthy questionnaire about the value of their college experience, providing the data reported here.

B. S. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	iv
MEASURES OF PROGRESS: SPRING 1984 STUDENT FOLLOW-UP	
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND: VEA FOLLOW-UP IN LOS RIOS	1
RELATED RESEARCH	2
METHODOLOGY: SURVEY RESEARCH DESIGN	4
Survey Development	4
Survey Population	4
Survey Instrument	5
Survey Procedures	5
Survey Responses	6
Data Analysis	7
RESULTS OF THE STUDY	8
SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL INFORMATION	8
Gender	8
Ethnicity	9
Age Groups	10
Major Fields of Interest	11
Educational Objectives	12
Completion of Educational Objectives	12
Reasons for Not Reenrolling	14
Current Educational/Employment Status	15
Ratings of College Courses and Services	15
Satisfaction with College Educational Experience	16
SECTION B: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION	17
Employer Information	17
Relationship of Job to Courses Completed	18
Reasons for Employment Outside Area of Preparation	18
Prior Employment in Occupational Area	19
Current Salary	19
Weekly Hours of Employment	20
Usefulness of Training in Performance of Job	21
Help Provided by Courses in Occupational Area	21

Page

SECTION C: EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION 22
Transfer Colleges 22
Transfer Majors 23
Problems in Transferring to Another College 24
Units Accepted at Transfer College 24
Status and Classification at Present College . . . 25
Rating of Preparation for Continuing Education . . 26

SECTION D: FUTURE PLANS 26
Units Completed at Los Rios College 26
Relationship of Courses Completed to Career Plans . 27
Interest in Additional Courses 28
General Comments 28

1984 AND 1983 SURVEYS COMPARED 29
Survey Populations 29
Adjusted Response Rates 30
Survey Instruments 30
Survey Results 30

IN CONCLUSION 33

RECOMMENDATIONS 34

REFERENCES 36

APPENDIX 38
Survey Questionnaire 39
Cover Letter, First Mailing 40
Cover Letter, Second Mailing 41
Survey Response Rates 42
Demographic Comparisons 43
Awards Granted/Survey Responses by Community College Major . . 44
Awards Granted Compared with Majors Predicted by USOE Codes . . 49

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Gender	9
2	Ethnicity	9
3	Age Groups	10
4	Community College Major Fields of Interest	11
5	Educational Objectives	12
6	Extent to Which Objective Has Been Completed and Plan to Pursue Objective Further	13
7	Education Required to Accomplish Educational Objective	13
8	Reasons for Not Reenrolling	14
9	Current Educational/Employment Status	15
10	Average Ratings of Courses in Major Field of Study and College Services Used	16
11	Satisfaction with College Educational Experience	17
12	Employer Zip Codes	18
13	Relationship of Job to Courses Completed	18
14	Reasons for Employment Outside Area of Preparation	19
15	Prior Employment in Occupational Area	19
16	Current Salary (Gross, Without Overtime)	20
17	Weekly Hours of Employment	20
18	Usefulness of Training in Performance of Job	21
19	Help Provided by Courses in Occupational Area	21
20	Transfer Colleges	22
21	Transfer Majors	23
22	Problems in Transferring to Another College	24

Table		Page
23	Units Accepted at Transfer College	25
24	Status/Classification at Present College	25
25	Rating of Preparation for Continuing Education	26
26	Units Completed at Los Rios College	27
27	Relationship of Course(s) Completed to Career Plans	27
28	Interest in Additional Courses	28

MEASURES OF PROGRESS:

SPRING 1984 STUDENT FOLLOW-UP

LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

INTRODUCTION

The Los Rios Community College District, established in 1965, serves the residents of Sacramento and El Dorado counties as well as portions of Yolo, Placer and Solano counties through its three colleges--American River College, Cosumnes River College, and Sacramento City College--and numerous outreach centers. It is the third largest community college district in California in terms of credit enrollment, which totals approximately 40,000 students.

In February 1984 the district published Follow-up of Occupational Education Students, Spring 1983, which represented the first phase of a long-range plan to improve student follow-up research in the district. That report described the results of a survey of 2,700 former students who completed an "occupational education" course during the 1981-82 academic year but did not reenroll at the same college in Fall 1982. The survey gathered data required for state and federal reports, as well as information regarding the former students' educational and career goals, employment and educational status, and perceptions of the programs and services offered by the colleges.

This new report builds upon and expands the concepts developed in the Spring 1983 study: the survey population of 4,280 included all who received a degree or certificate in Fall 1982 or Spring 1983 (general education/liberal arts graduates as well as occupational majors); the survey instrument was redesigned to reflect more accurately the specific needs of the Los Rios District; and the data analysis was refined.

BACKGROUND: VEA FOLLOW-UP IN LOS RIOS

The Federal Vocational Education Act as amended in 1976 requires states to submit annual reports on the employment status of former students of public vocational training programs. In 1978 the National Center for Educational Statistics' Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) was mandated as the reporting method to be followed. In California, guidelines outlined in the Student Accountability Model (SAM) Operations Manual published by the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office are used to identify "occupational" students to be surveyed for such reports.

Follow-up of former occupational students from the Los Rios District has routinely exceeded federal and state mandates: all occupational programs are surveyed annually, even though reports are required only for approximately one-fourth of the programs in a given year. While

the three district colleges used a common questionnaire for this survey for some years, procedures for conducting the study and for reporting the results were left to the individual colleges prior to 1982.

In Fall 1982, the annual survey of occupational education students was designated as the first phase for implementation of a more comprehensive long-range plan for districtwide follow-up of Los Rios students. For that pilot effort, college and district administrators agreed to follow common procedures in conducting the Spring 1983 survey and to report the results in a single publication.

A search of related literature and an examination of various survey instruments then in use led to the decision to use the questionnaires and processing services of the Center for Information Services, commonly known as the Tex-SIS (Student Information System) Follow-Up System (Hall and Reed, 1979) for the Spring 1983 Los Rios survey. Two questionnaires were used: the GRAD form for those who had graduated or earned a certificate, and the NRS form for nonreturning students who had received no formal award. In addition to the items required for federal and state reporting, the Tex-SIS questionnaires also elicited information on some 24 additional data elements useful in educational planning and research.

Three important recommendations for improving Los Rios student follow-up research were made as a result of that study (Lee, 1984): (1) that future surveys include all students (general education/liberal arts as well as occupational) who graduated or earned a certificate during the academic year being studied; (2) that the major field in which the degree or certificate was actually granted be identified in reporting results for use at the program level; and (3) that development of the survey form and analysis of the data be handled within the district. This study incorporates those and other recommendations from the 1983 survey.

RELATED RESEARCH

Related research conducted by staff members at district colleges during the past several years has included an examination of why students withdraw from classes and from college (Rasor, 1980); a follow-up of alumni three years after leaving college (Rasor and McGill, 1981); a survey of the opinions and goals of enrolled students (Rasor, 1982); and a comprehensive study of reverse-transfer students attending Los Rios colleges (Renkiewicz and others, 1982). In addition, the Los Rios District Office of Planning and Research has recently published an update of enrollment statistics within the Los Rios District which focused on the decline in black student enrollment and included a special follow-up survey of nonreturning black students (Coffey, 1984).

Los Rios District colleges have also participated in statewide research studies: Sacramento City College was among the colleges included in the 1978-81 Statewide Longitudinal Study (Sheldon, 1982) which followed 6,500 California community students over a three-year period; American

River College was part of a state pilot project to improve procedures used in vocational student follow-up in California (Brooks, 1983); and Cosumnes River College is among the colleges currently field-testing the procedures recommended as a result of the Brooks study.

In ongoing research, the Los Rios District is presently coordinating a study of transfer students conducted jointly with the University of California at Davis and California State University, Sacramento, as a part of the Research Agenda of the California Association of Community Colleges. This study will follow the progress of students who transferred to one of the two senior institutions in Fall 1980 after attending a Los Rios college. The results are expected to be published later in 1985.

METHODOLOGY: SURVEY RESEARCH DESIGN

Survey Development

This survey was designed to gather general information useful to the district and its colleges in educational planning, as well as to obtain specific data required for federal and state reports. Survey procedures were developed by a committee which included representatives from occupational education, research, and data processing at both the college and district levels. The District Office of Planning and Research was responsible for coordinating the project, analyzing the data, and reporting the survey results.

Survey Population

The survey population included all those who received an associate degree or certificate from one of the three Los Rios District colleges in Fall 1982 or Spring 1983, plus "occupational achievers" who attended during one of those semesters but did not reenroll at the same college in Fall 1983.

Occupational achievers are those who completed at least one course defined as "advanced occupational" by the California Community College Chancellor's Office in its Student Accountability Model (SAM) Operations Manual (Revised 1981), but received no award. They were included in the survey because each college is required to follow up on such students annually for Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) reporting purposes. Although they are considered "occupational" by VEDS guidelines, many were actually majoring in liberal arts or transfer programs, according to their own self-reports. Thus, although they do not represent a random sample of noncompleters, they do provide a relatively broad sample of that group.

To facilitate VEDS reporting, former students were assigned a completion code to indicate the award they received and to differentiate graduates and certificate earners identified by VEDS guidelines from those not so identified. These procedures resulted in a survey population of 4,280, distributed as follows:

Completion Code	ARC	CRC	SCC	District
1) VEDS Graduates	465	105	237	807
2) VEDS Certificate Earners	83	13	126	227
3) VEDS Occupational Achievers	826	401	454	1,681
4) Non-VEDS Graduates	763	162	470	1,395
5) Non-VEDS Certificate Earners*	114	13	43	170
Total Survey Population	2,256	694	1,330	4,280

*These persons received a certificate in an occupational program but were not identified by the VEDS guidelines.

Survey Instrument

A single survey instrument was developed for this study, incorporating most of the items from the two Tex-SIS Student Follow-Up forms used in the District's Spring 1983 study. The Tex-SIS forms had been selected after a careful review of surveys identified through a search of ERIC documents and had been extensively field tested and widely used throughout the state of Texas and elsewhere. Revisions and/or additions were made only as needed to develop a composite form and meet local needs. By retaining the Tex-SIS items and options intact as much as possible, responses to most items can be compared to the Los Rios Spring 1983 study (see page 29) and to surveys conducted elsewhere if desired.

The questionnaire included four sections:

A. General Information (to be answered by all)
B. Employment Information (to be answered if employed)
C. Educational Information (to be answered if enrolled in college)
D. Future Plans (to be answered by all)

The questions regarding employment and its relationship to college courses completed were worded precisely to conform with VEDS requirements. At the bottom of the form, space was provided for comments.

The questionnaire was professionally type-set, and provision was made to use the individual college name and logo on forms printed for each college. Questionnaires were reproduced by District Office printing staff, color-coded to differentiate graduates from nongraduates and to indicate those identified by VEDS guidelines. A sample survey form is included in the Appendix.

Survey Procedures

District Data Processing identified the former students to be surveyed, and provided each college with a computer-generated master list in which names were grouped by U. S. Office of Education (USOE) code and then alphabetized by completion code. The USOE code indicated the program identified with the "highest SAM priority" occupational course completed by the student during 1982-83 (Priority A = apprenticeship; B = advanced occupational; C = clearly occupational; D = possibly occupational). The lists also included demographic data and, as recommended in the Los Rios Spring 1983 follow-up study, the correct program major code for those who had received a degree or certificate.

Two sets of address labels were also printed, each containing the former student's name, address, and the following items as applicable:

1) USOE Code
2) SAM Priority Level
3) Completion Code
4) Los Rios Program Major Code
5) Special Status Code (Handicapped/Limited English/Disadvantaged)

Two mailings were sent: the first, during the week of April 9, 1984, to all students on the lists; the second (including another questionnaire), approximately three weeks later to all who had not yet responded.

Separate cover letters were used for each mailing (a sample of each is included in the Appendix). The letters were reproduced at each college using college letterhead and carried the signatures of the President and either the Associate Dean of Occupational Education (for VEDS students) or the Dean of Instruction (for non-VEDS students).

Each packet included a cover letter, a questionnaire (color-keyed to completion code), and a Number 9 self-addressed, postpaid envelope for returning the completed questionnaire, assembled in a Number 10 window envelope. Each college printed its own Number 9 envelopes with the specific wording required for postpaid first class handling. Based on information from the ERIC review of similar studies and the response rates in previous Los Rios follow-up surveys, materials were ordered for a second mailing numbering approximately 85% of the first.

While each college handled the mailing of questionnaires to its own former students and responses were returned to that college, a concerted effort was made to ensure that common procedures were followed by all.

Survey Responses

Responses from 2,042 former students were received and coded for data analysis. Since a total of 320 questionnaires (7.5% of the original sample) had been returned by the post office as undeliverable, this represented an overall adjusted response rate of 51.6%. Adjusted response rates by college and completion status are shown below (certificate earners are included with GRADs in the respective categories):

Completion Category	ARC	CRC	SSC	District
VEDS Graduates	54.3%	63.7%	60.1%	57.3%
VEDS Achievers	43.3%	46.7%	43.4%	44.2%
Non-VEDS Graduates	56.3%	56.3%	54.0%	55.6%
Overall VEDS Response Rates	47.8%	50.6%	50.8%	49.2%
Overall Response Rates	51.1%	52.0%	52.1%	51.6%

After the information required for VEDS reporting had been extracted and summarized by USOE code, the responses were regrouped according to the major program in which the degree or certificate, if any, had actually been granted (rather than by the major associated with the occupational course completed in the last year of attendance, as was done in the Los Rios Spring 1983 study). A more detailed table showing response rate calculations, as well as an analysis of the relationship between actual awards granted and the majors "projected" by USOE codes using the SAM matrix, can be found in the Appendix of this report.

Data Analysis

Responses were analyzed using SPSS-X, a computer software program developed by SPSS Inc. for use in social science and other types of research. Survey results are reported for three groups of respondents: general education/liberal arts majors (referred to in this report as GE GRADs); occupational education majors (OE GRADs); and nonreturning students who received no formal award (NRSs). Summary statistics for the district as a whole, by response category, are reported in the section which follows. Tables showing survey results by college were prepared as an Addendum to this report, and the entire data file is available for further analysis as time and resources permit.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

An analysis of the 2,042 completed questionnaires received in this survey revealed that the three response categories were almost equally represented:

- The 667 GE GRAD respondents included all those who had received associate degrees in general studies, general business, humanities/fine arts, home economics, math/science, or social science. This group comprised 32.4% of the total responses.
- The OE GRADs included 701 respondents whose degree or certificate had been awarded in a major considered "occupational" for VEDS reporting and represented 34.3% of the total.
- The 679 NRSs who completed an occupational course but received no formal award made up the remaining 33.3% of responses received.

The number of respondents in each category is indicated in the heading of each table, since not all questions were answered by all respondents.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL INFORMATION

All former students surveyed were asked to complete this section of the questionnaire. Tables 1 through 3 provide information on the gender, ethnicity, and age of the 2,042 respondents. These demographic characteristics are also compared with the those of the original survey population and with the Fall 1982 district enrollment, from which most of the survey population was drawn.

The remaining tables in this section provide data on the respondents' major fields of study, educational objectives, progress toward completing their objectives, reasons for not reenrolling, current educational and employment status, ratings of college courses and services, and general satisfaction with their college educational experience.

Gender

As shown in Table 1 on the next page, almost 56% of the respondents to this study were female. For GE GRADs and NRSs the percentages of women were even higher, while the OE GRAD respondents were divided almost evenly between males and females.

The gender distribution of the original survey population was 51.6% male and 48.4% female; for the total district enrollment in Fall 1982, when most of those surveyed were enrolled, comparable figures were 45.3% male and 54.7% female. Thus the percentages of men and women responding to the survey are close to the actual Fall 1982 district enrollment, but proportionately more women than men in the survey population returned their completed questionnaires.

Table 1
GENDER

GENDER	District Totals GE GRAD N=662	OE GRAD N=701	NRS N=679	Total N=2,042
Male	37.0%	49.5%	45.7%	44.2%
Female	63.0%	50.5%	54.3%	55.8%

Ethnicity

Table 2 shows the ethnic distribution of the respondents to this survey. Asians and Pacific Islanders comprise the largest minority group (8.6%) among those responding; when Filipinos are combined with this group, as was done in the Tex-SIS questionnaire used in 1983, the Asian category totals almost 10%. Blacks and Hispanics are equally represented, with 5.6% for each group.

Table 2
ETHNICITY

ETHNIC GROUP	District Totals GE GRAD N=662	OE GRAD N=701	NRS N=679	Total N=2,042
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.2%	3.0%	1.8%	2.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	10.1%	7.7%	8.0%	8.6%
Filipino	1.7%	.7%	1.3%	1.2%
Black/not Hispanic	6.5%	5.3%	5.2%	5.6%
Hispanic	5.3%	6.0%	5.4%	5.6%
White/not Hispanic	74.8%	77.2%	78.2%	76.7%
Nonresident Alien	.5%	.1%	.1%	.2%

The percentage of whites in the response group (76.7%) was very close to their proportion in the survey population (75.7%), but there were variations among other ethnic groups: while Asians (including Filipinos) and blacks each represented 8.4% of the survey population, they comprised 9.8% and 5.6%, respectively, of total responses. Other groups tended to respond in proportion to their representation in the survey population.

It should be noted that in regard to gender and ethnicity, the computer program used to generate the survey mailing list defaulted nonresponses into "male" and "white," thus giving somewhat higher percentages in these two categories than would otherwise be the case. After adjusting for this factor, the original survey population was found to include 4.1% more whites, 1.1% more Asians, and 2.3% fewer blacks than their proportions in the district Fall 1982 enrollment (see Appendix for detailed comparisons).

Age Groups

As shown in Table 3, respondents between the ages of 20 and 24 made up the largest age group in each of the three categories and comprised almost one-third of the total; however, there were wide percentage variations: more than 45% of the GE GRADs but only 20% of the NRSs were in this group. Conversely, almost 48% of the NRSs and 43% of the OE GRADs were 30 to 54 years of age, while fewer than 29% of the GE GRADs were in this range. The proportions in the 25-to-29 age group were more similar among the respondent categories, with a range of less than six percentage points.

Table 3
AGE GROUPS

AGE GROUP	District Totals			
	GE GRAD N=652	OE GRAD N=701	NRS N=679	Total N=2,042
16-19	2.9%	.9%	1.3%	1.7%
20-24	45.6%	28.2%	20.2%	31.2%
25-29	16.2%	21.8%	19.3%	19.1%
30-34	9.4%	14.7%	14.4%	12.9%
35-44	12.1%	18.4%	19.7%	16.8%
45-54	7.1%	10.0%	13.5%	10.2%
55-64	1.8%	2.1%	4.1%	2.7%
65 and over	.5%	.1%	.6%	.4%
Undefined	4.5%	3.7%	6.8%	5.0%
MEDIAN AGE	24.4	28.9	31.5	28.3
AVERAGE AGE	28.9	31.7	34.2	31.6

The median age of all respondents was 28.3, with a range of 7.1 years between the youngest group (GE GRADs) and the oldest group (NRSs). The average age of all those responding was 31.6, with a range of 5.3 years.

No age data were available for the original survey population, and the age group categories used in the Fall 1982 Student Characteristics Report were generally different from those in the survey questionnaire. However, since one category--the 25-to-29 age group--was the same, some observations can be made. As compared to the overall district enrollment from which the survey population was drawn, more people aged 30 and older (43% to 30%) and fewer people aged 16-24 (33% to 52%) responded to the survey. Among those in the 25-29 range, the response rate was very close to that group's representation in the district population.

In summarizing these demographic findings, the population surveyed for this study contained proportionately more men and more whites than the Fall 1982 district enrollment as a whole. The 51.6% who responded to the survey included proportionately more women, more persons aged 30 or older, slightly more Asians and fewer blacks than their representation in the original survey population.

Major Fields of Interest

Table 4 shows a condensed list of the major fields of interest reported by respondents to this survey (see Appendix for detailed list). The 96 Los Rios program titles are grouped according to the major interest fields listed on the district's application for admission form. This list was adapted from that proposed in the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) and has been used in Los Rios since Fall 1983.

Table 4
COMMUNITY COLLEGE MAJOR FIELDS OF INTEREST

MAJOR FIELD OF INTEREST	District Totals			
	GE GRAD N=662	OE GRAD N=701	NRS N=679	Total N=2,042
Agriculture/Natural Resources	- -	4.3%	3.2%	2.5%
Architecture/Env. Design	- -	1.7%	2.4%	1.4%
Business/Management/Office Adm.	24.9%	21.5%	27.1%	24.5%
Communications/Journalism	- -	1.6%	3.2%	1.6%
Computer and Information Sciences	- -	5.8%	3.8%	3.3%
Education/Physical Education	- -	.6%	.3%	.3%
Fine and Applied Arts	8.0%	2.7%	3.1%	4.6%
Gen. Education/Interdisciplinary	37.6%	- -	1.9%	12.8%
Allied Health Professions	- -	14.0%	5.0%	6.5%
Home Econ./Family Cons. Science	.5%	4.9%	4.6%	3.3%
Law/Legal Assisting	- -	1.3%	.6%	.6%
Library Science/Technology	- -	.1%	- -	.1%
Occupational Trades/Technologies	- -	35.7%	24.6%	20.4%
Physical Sciences/Math	15.3%	- -	.1%	5.0%
Protective/Social Services	- -	5.8%	9.4%	5.1%
Social/Behavioral Sciences	13.7%	- -	.9%	4.8%
Undecided	- -	- -	9.7%	3.2%

Some of these major interest fields are exclusively either "general" or "occupational", while others may include both types of majors. General Education/Interdisciplinary was the major field for almost 38% of the GE GRADs but none of the OE GRADs; conversely, Occupational Trades and Technologies accounted for almost 36% of the OE GRADs but none of the GE GRADs. On the other hand, the field of Business/Management/Office Administration included both general and occupational associate degrees plus those in preparation for a four-year degree in business or related fields. It was the major interest of from 21% to 27% of each category of respondents and of almost 25% of the total.

Among NRSs, 47% were majoring in either Occupational Trades/Technologies or Business/Management/Office Administration, and 9.7% were undecided. (The method used to assign major codes to NRSs who did not indicate a major field of interest is described in the Appendix.)

Educational Objectives

The first item on the questionnaire (following demographic information) was "What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our college?" As shown in Table 5 below, more than 61% of the total respondents had a job-related objective; 29% were interested primarily in earning university transfer credit and approximately 10% attended for personal interest or other reasons.

Table 5
EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES
Item A-1

	District Totals			
PRIMARY OBJECTIVE	GE GRAD N=661	OE GRAD N=698	NRS N=677	Total N=2,036
Improve job skills	6.5%	22.3%	34.7%	21.3%
Prepare for job to be obtained	16.6%	62.0%	39.7%	39.9%
University transfer credit	68.8%	9.0%	11.1%	29.1%
Personal interest	5.4%	3.7%	12.3%	7.1%
Other	2.6%	2.9%	2.2%	2.6%

When the figures in Table 5 are examined by response categories, interesting contrasts appear: almost 85% of the OE GRADs and 75% of the NRSs had attended primarily to "prepare for a job to be obtained" or "to improve job skills," but only 23% of the GE GRADs cited these as primary reasons. Conversely, almost 69% of the GE GRADs had attended to acquire university transfer credit, a goal which was the primary interest of only 9% of the OE GRADs and 11% of the NRSs. These differences in the primary reason for attending are crucial in the consideration of other responses to this survey, as discussed in the following pages.

Completion of Educational Objectives

Survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which their primary educational objective had been completed, whether they planned to pursue that objective further (and if so, where), and the amount of education required to accomplish their objective. Responses are shown in Tables 6 and 7 on the next page.

As might be expected, almost 60% of all graduates (both GE and OE) indicated their educational goal had been fully completed, with another one-third or more reporting partial completion (Table 6). Of perhaps even greater interest is the fact that 34.5% of the NRSs, even though they did not receive a degree or certificate, reported that their goal had been fully completed, and another 57% indicated it was partially complete.

Table 6
EXTENT TO WHICH OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN COMPLETED
AND PLAN TO PURSUE OBJECTIVE FURTHER
Items A-2, A-3

	District Totals			
EXTENT COMPLETED	GE GRAD N=656	OE GRAD N=699	NRS N=676	Total N=2,031
Fully Completed	59.3%	59.4%	34.5%	51.1%
Partially Completed	37.3%	34.2%	57.1%	42.8%
Not Completed	3.4%	6.4%	8.4%	6.1%
PURSUE FURTHER?	N=643	N=681	N=656	N=1,980
No	12.4%	32.5%	27.4%	24.3%
Yes	87.6%	67.5%	72.6%	75.7%
IF YES, WHERE?	N=574	N=462	N=467	N=1,503
At Our College	11.5%	30.7%	56.5%	31.4%
At Another Two-Year College	2.3%	4.3%	8.6%	4.9%
At a Four-Year College	82.4%	55.0%	24.8%	56.1%
Other	3.8%	10.0%	10.1%	7.7%

More than 75% of the total respondents indicated they planned to pursue their educational objective further, with 82% of the GE GRADs and 55% of the OE GRADs intending to transfer to a four-year college or university. Almost one-third of all respondents (including more than 56% of NRSs) plan to return to the same community college to pursue their education at some future time.

As shown in Table 7 below, 71% of all respondents indicated that an associate degree or certificate had been required to accomplish their educational objective. More than 25% of the total responding, and more than 48% of NRSs, had intended to take only selected courses and did not aspire to a degree or certificate.

Table 7
EDUCATION REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVE
Item A-4

	District Totals			
EDUCATION REQUIRED	GE GRAD N=653	OE GRAD N=692	NRS N=662	Total N=2,007
Selected Course(s)	20.5%	8.2%	48.2%	25.4%
Certificate Program	2.5%	20.5%	17.5%	13.7%
Two-Year Associate Degree	73.5%	68.5%	29.9%	57.4%
Other	3.5%	2.7%	4.4%	3.5%

Reasons for Not Reenrolling

When asked their most important reason for not reenrolling at the same college (Table 8), almost 58% of all respondents indicated they had completed their desired program (degree, certificate, or courses). As might be expected, this included nearly 70% of the GRADs; of perhaps greater significance is the fact that 36% of NRSs, who had completed no formal program, also chose this response. These data are consistent with those reported in Table 6 (page 13) regarding completion of educational objective.

There were other interesting contrasts among the responding groups: reasons related to employment (found or seeking employment/job hours conflict with school) were cited by almost 23% of the NRSs and 11% of OE GRADs, but by fewer than 4% of GE GRADs. Almost 10% of all respondents checked "transferred to another college," but the percentages citing this reason varied from 2.0% (OE GRADs) to 18.7% (GE GRADs).

Table 8
REASONS FOR NOT REENROLLING
Item A-5

REASON FOR NOT REENROLLING	District Totals GE GRAD N=638	OE GRAD N=650	NRS N=64[illegible]	Total N=1,931
Completed Degree or Certificate	61.8%	68.6%	17.1%	49.2%
Completed Desired Courses	3.8%	3.1%	19.1%	8.6%
Transferred to Another College	18.7%	2.0%	8.2%	9.6%
Job Hours Conflict With School	2.2%	4.6%	15.7%	6.8%
Found or Seeking Employment	1.4%	6.8%	9.0%	5.7%
Inadequate Course Availability	1.9%	.9%	6.7%	3.2%
Moved From Area/Transportation	1.4%	1.8%	4.4%	2.5%
College Was Too Expensive	.5%	.5%	.9%	.8%
Dissatisfied with Instruction	.3%	.2%	2.3%	.9%
Dissatisfied with Course Content	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%
Grade Problems	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%
Other Personal/Family Reasons	2.0%	2.3%	9.2%	4.5%
Other Reasons	6.1%	8.8%	8.4%	7.8%

Reasons over which the colleges might be expected to have some degree of control accounted for relatively small response percentages: "inadequate course availability" was cited by 6.7% of the NRSs, but by fewer than 2% of all GRADs. "Dissatisfied with instruction" and "dissatisfied with course content" combined totalled only 1.1% of all responses, and "grade problems" were cited by none of the graduates and fewer than 1% of NRSs. Slightly more than 12% did not return because of personal/family or other reasons, but fewer than 1% cited "college was too expensive."

Further data analysis revealed that the responses to this item were consistent with those reported in the district's Fall 1984 Enrollment Update (Coffey, 1984) with respect to black nonreturning students.

Current Educational/Employment Status

Table 9 shows the current educational and employment status of respondents to the survey. As might be expected from data discussed in previous sections, almost 70% of the GE GRADs were attending school when they responded to this survey; perhaps even more interesting is the fact that close to 3[illegible]% of all other survey respondents were also enrolled in school at the time. Since approximately 60% of GE GRADs and 80% of other respondents were also employed at the time of the survey, it is apparent that many respondents were both working and attending school.

Table 9
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL/EMPLOYMENT STATUS
Items A-6, A-7

	District Totals			
EDUCATIONAL STATUS	GE GRAD N=661	OE GRAD N=698	NRS N=672	Total N=2,031
Currently Attending School	69.3%	32.8%	28.6%	43.3%
Not Currently Attending	30.7%	67.2%	71.4%	56.7%
EMPLOYMENT STATUS	GE GRAD N=654	OE GRAD N=697	NRS N=673	Total N=2,024
Employed (except military)	59.9%	78.3%	78.2%	72.3%
Employed (full-time military)	.8%	1.9%	1.2%	1.3%
Unemployed, Actively Seeking	10.2%	9.6%	8.3%	9.4%
Not in Labor Force, Not Seeking	29.1%	10.2%	12.3%	17.0%

The percentages of respondents who indicated they were "unemployed and actively seeking" work were relatively consistent among the three groups surveyed, and the 9.4% total compares favorably with the March 1984 unemployment rate of 9.9% for the Sacramento Metropolitan Service Area. Seventeen percent of all respondents, including more than 29% of the GE GRADs, were not in the labor force and not seeking employment at the time of this survey.

Ratings of College Courses and Services

Respondents to the survey were given the opportunity to rate (on a scale of 5 = Very Good to 1 = Very Poor) various characteristics of courses they had completed in their major field and college services they had utilized. The average ratings given by the three responding groups are shown in Table 10 on the next page.

Consistent with responses to previous follow-up studies in the Los Rios District (Renkiewicz, 1982; Lee, 1984), "quality of instruction," "instructor interest" and "content of courses" received the highest ratings from respondents to this survey; all were rated above 4.0. College services receiving ratings of 4.0 or higher included library services, learning centers/labs, and veterans services.

Table 10
AVERAGE RATINGS OF COURSES IN MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY
AND COLLEGE SERVICES USED
Items A-8 and A-9
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

	District Totals			
COURSE CHARACTERISTIC	GE GRAD N=614	OE GRAD N=692	NRS N=606	Total N=1,912
Quality of Instruction	4.18	4.24	4.14	4.19
Instructor Interest	4.10	4.23	4.20	4.18
Content of Course(s)	4.00	4.13	4.05	4.06
Grading/Testing	3.92	3.97	3.92	3.94
Class Size	3.73	3.80	3.84	3.79
Instructional Media	3.69	3.84	3.75	3.77
SERVICE	GE GRAD N=559	OE GRAD N=547	NRS N=298	Total N=1,404
Library Services	4.04	4.20	4.11	4.12
Learning Center/Labs	4.06	4.08	4.04	4.07
Veterans Services	4.05	3.99	3.97	4.01
Services for Disabled	3.95	3.93	4.10	3.98
Health Center	3.60	3.99	3.97	3.85
Financial Aids	3.61	3.93	3.89	3.81
Tutoring Services	3.76	3.61	3.75	3.70
Student Activities	3.60	3.67	3.73	3.65
Assessment Center	3.70	3.58	3.57	3.63
Counseling/Advisement	3.50	3.72	3.53	3.59
Job Placement Services	3.44	3.27	3.17	3.31

Almost all the course characteristics and student services listed were rated well above 3.5, and ratings were relatively consistent among the three responding groups. Respondents were asked to rate only the services they had used, so the number of responses varied with each item (the N given is the maximum for that response category).

These ratings indicate general approval of the programs and services provided by the district's colleges, and correlate well with the data in Table 11 below.

Satisfaction with College Educational Experience

The final question in Section A asked respondents to rate their feeling about their educational experience in general. On a five-point scale, possible responses ranged from Very Satisfied (5) to Very Disappointed (1). As shown in Table 11 on the next page, almost 87% expressed better than average satisfaction with their experience, and another 10% gave an "average" rating; fewer than 3% indicated disappointment. The average rating by all respondents was 4.22, and for each of the three responding groups was above 4.0.

Table 11
SATISFACTION WITH COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE
Item A-1C
Ratings: 5 = Very Satisfied . . . 1 = Very Disappointed

SATISFACTION WITH EDUCATION	District Totals GE GRAD N=658	OE GRAD N=698	NRS N=672	Total N=2,028
Very Satisfied	42.2%	42.8%	30.8%	38.7%
Satisfied	48.2%	46.3%	50.0%	48.1%
Average	7.1%	8.2%	16.1%	10.5%
Disappointed	2.3%	2.3%	2.5%	2.4%
Very Disappointed	.2%	.4%	.6%	.4%
AVERAGE RATING	4.30	4.29	4.08	4.22

SECTION B: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

Respondents who were employed or in full-time military service when they completed their questionnaire were asked to complete Section B, which elicited certain information about their employment. As indicated in Table 9 on page 15, this included 73.6% of those responding to the survey (397 GE GRADs, 559 OE GRADs, and 534 NRSs, for a total of 1,490). As many as 1,394 completed at least part of this section, although not all respondents answered every question.

Included in this section were all questions mandated for VEDS reporting, as well as several other items of interest to the Los Rios District.

Employer Information

The first item in this section requested the name and address of the respondent's employer, as well as the job title and duties of the person completing the questionnaire. Respondents were also asked to provide the name and title of their immediate supervisor so that the opportunity could be provided for that person to participate in future surveys made by the college to evaluate courses and programs offered. A total of 930 respondents provided their employer's ZIP Code, which was coded for computer analysis; the other information provided is available on the completed questionnaires retained at each college.

As shown in Table 12 on the next page, more than 87% of respondents to this item were working in the Sacramento area at the time of this survey. When Stockton and the northern Sacramento valley are included, the percentage reaches almost 90%. Another 5% were employed in the San Francisco/East Bay/San Jose area; fewer than 5% were working elsewhere in California or out of state. The OE GRADs tended to be employed outside the greater Sacramento area slightly more often than the other two groups.

Table 12
EMPLOYER ZIP CODES
Item B-1

ZIP CODE	District Totals GE GRAD N=252	OE GRAD N=344	NRS N=334	Total N=930
Sacramento Area	90.9%	83.5%	88.3%	87.2%
Northern Sacramento Valley	.4%	2.6%	1.5%	1.6%
Stockton Area	.0%	.9%	2.1%	1.1%
San Francisco Bay Area	.4%	2.3%	.9%	1.3%
Oakland-East Bay	1.2%	1.7%	1.5%	1.5%
San Jose Area	1.2%	3.8%	2.1%	2.5%
Los Angeles Area	2.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%
Other California Areas	1.6%	2.0%	1.2%	1.6%
Out of State	2.4%	2.0%	1.2%	1.8%

Relationship of Job to Courses Completed

More than 76% of OE GRADs and 66% of NRSs reported that they were employed in a job related to the courses they had completed (Table 13).

Table 13
RELATIONSHIP OF JOB TO COURSES COMPLETED
Item B-2

RELATIONSHIP	District Totals GE GRAD N=361	OE GRAD N=531	NRS N=500	Total N=1,392
Directly/Closely Related	34.1%	76.1%	66.0%	61.6%
Remotely/Not at All Related	65.9%	23.9%	34.0%	38.4%

While only 34% of the GE GRADs were employed in a related field, this is not surprising since their majors were general rather than occupational in nature. Almost 70% of the GE GRADs were still attending college at the time of the survey (Table 9, page 15), so it also seems likely that many were employed in part-time jobs rather than in career positions.

Reasons for Employment Outside Area of Preparation

Respondents employed in an area not related to college courses completed were asked why they were working in another field (Table 14). "Transfer to a four-year college" was cited as the primary reason by more than 50% of the GE GRADs, and by a substantial number of other respondents. Among NRSs, the most frequent response was "not qualified for job in field" (27.6%) and among OE GRADs, "could not find job in field" (23.8%). More than 23% checked reasons related to personal choice: 13% preferred other work; 7% found a better paying job; and 3% had worked in the field of their preparation but changed.

Table 14
REASONS FOR EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE AREA OF PREPARATION
Item B-3

REASON	District Totals GE GRAD N=226	OE GRAD N=130	NRS N=152	Total N=508
Transferred to Four-Year College	51.3%	13.8%	14.5%	30.7%
Not Qualified for Job in Field	14.6%	17.7%	27.6%	19.3%
Preferred Work in Another Field	11.5%	13.8%	14.5%	13.0%
Better Paying Job, Another Field	4.4%	12.3%	7.2%	7.3%
Could Not Find Job in Field	8.0%	23.8%	11.2%	13.0%
Worked in Field but Changed	2.2%	4.6%	3.3%	3.1%
Other	8.0%	13.8%	21.7%	13.6%

Prior Employment in Occupational Area

In a related question, respondents were asked if they had been employed in their occupational area before enrolling at the college (Table 15).

Table 15
PRIOR EMPLOYMENT IN OCCUPATIONAL AREA
Item B-6

PRIOR EMPLOYMENT	District Totals GE GRAD N=362	OE GRAD N=532	NRS N=500	Total N=1,394
Yes	49.4%	41.9%	61.0%	50.7%
No	50.6%	58.1%	39.0%	49.3%

While the total responses and those for GE GRADs indicate a nearly even "split" in responses to this item, the responses of OE GRADs and NRSs are important. As shown previously in Table 5 (page 12), 62% of the OE GRADs had enrolled primarily to "prepare for a job to be obtained." Table 14 above indicates that 58% of the OE GRADs were employed in a new field at the time of this survey. Of the NRSs, 39.7% had enrolled primarily to prepare for a new job (Table 5), and Table 15 above indicates that 39% were in a new field.

Current Salary

The questions with respect to salary were worded precisely as required for VEDS reporting, which permits respondents to report their salaries according to their actual pay period (hour/week/month/year). Averages for each pay period are shown in Table 16 on the next page. To provide a common basis for comparison purposes, salaries were converted to monthly equivalents and averages were computed for all full-time employment and for all employment (full- and part-time).

Table 16
CURRENT SALARY (GROSS, WITHOUT OVERTIME)
Item B-4

PAY PERIOD	District Totals GE GRAD N=293	OE GRAD N=393	NRS N=363	Total N=1,049
Per Hour	$ 7.16	$ 7.90	$ 8.08	$ 7.72
Per Week	269.69	298.06	468.41	319.61
Per Month	1,278.95	1,338.72	1,469.72	1,379.63
Per Year	20,017.33	22,326.98	23,279.61	22,212.29
AVERAGE PER MONTH				
All Full-time	$1,538.81	$1,548.36	$1,657.45	$1,588.44
All (FT and PT)	1,146.59	1,367.29	1,499.19	1,351.29

Salaries reported by NRSs were higher than those for either group of graduates. This phenomenon holds true for each type of pay period as well as when average monthly equivalents are computed for all employment and for full-time employment only (35 hours per week or more). These data are not surprising, however, when other factors are considered: NRSs were generally older than GRADs (Table 3, page 10); they were more likely to have enrolled to upgrade job skills rather than to acquire a new job (Table 5, page 12), to have been employed in their field before enrolling (Table 15, page 19), and to be working full time (Table 17, below).

Weekly Hours of Employment

More than 82% of the NRSs and almost 78% of the OE GRADs, but only 56% of the GE GRADs, were employed 35 hours per week or more (Table 17). The average weekly hours for each group reflect these same patterns.

Table 17
WEEKLY HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT
Item B-5

HOURS PER WEEK	District Totals GE GRAD N=292	OE GRAD N=401	NRS N=368	Total N=1,061
Fewer than 35	44.2%	22.2%	17.9%	26.8%
35-39	3.8%	5.5%	3.3%	4.2%
40	42.1%	63.1%	66.6%	58.5%
Over 40	9.9%	9.2%	12.2%	10.5%
AVERAGE WEEKLY HOURS	33.0	37.6	38.9	36.8

Usefulness of Training in Performance of Job

When asked to evaluate the training provided by the college as to its usefulness in on-the-job performance (Table 18), respondents gave high marks to their college programs.

Table 18
USEFULNESS OF TRAINING IN PERFORMANCE OF JOB
Item B-7
Ratings: 5 = Very Good . . . 1 = Very Poor

	District Totals			
RATING	GE GRAD N=320	OE GRAD N=518	NRS N=457	Total N=1,295
Very Good	17.5%	37.1%	27.8%	29.0%
Good	39.4%	40.0%	40.0%	39.8%
Average	33.4%	18.7%	26.3%	25.0%
Poor	5.6%	2.7%	3.5%	3.7%
Very Poor	4.1%	1.5%	2.4%	2.5%
AVERAGE RATING	3.60	4.08	3.87	3.89

Almost 69% of the total respondents rated their training Good or Very Good, and another 25% marked Average. Among OE GRADs, more than 77% gave ratings of Good or Very Good. Even among the GE GRADs, who were less likely to be employed in the field of their training, more than 90% rated their program's usefulness as Average or better.

Help Provided by Courses in Occupational Area

Respondents also reported that courses in their occupational area had helped them in specific ways (Table 19). Almost 72% of all those responding indicated their courses had helped them either to obtain their job or to perform or advance on their job. Among OE GRADs, almost 83% reported these benefits.

Table 19
HELP PROVIDED BY COURSES IN OCCUPATIONAL AREA
Item B-8

	District Totals			
HELP RECEIVED	GE GRAD N=347	OE GRAD N=529	NRS N=486	Total N=1,362
Helped to Obtain Job	19.6%	53.3%	28.8%	36.0%
Helped Perform on Present Job	32.6%	22.7%	32.7%	28.8%
Helped Advance on Present Job	4.6%	6.8%	8.8%	7.0%
None of the Above	40.1%	14.2%	24.9%	24.6%
Other	3.2%	3.0%	4.7%	3.7%

SECTION C: EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

Respondents who had enrolled in another school since leaving the college conducting the survey were asked to complete Section C, which requested information regarding their current or most recently attended college. As shown in Table 9 on page 15, 43% of all respondents to the survey (879 individuals) reported they were attending school at the time of the survey. As many as 783 persons completed at least part of this section, although not all respondents answered every question. Of these 783, 446 (57.0%) were GE GRADs, 152 (19.4%) were OE GRADs, and 185 (23.6%) were NRSs. Their responses are shown in Tables 20 through 25 which follow.

Transfer Colleges

As shown in Table 20, the large majority of the 726 respondents who identified their transfer college matriculated at a California State University campus: 54% transferred to CSU, Sacramento, and another 7.7% chose one of the other CSU campuses. The University of California at Davis and other UC campuses accounted for almost 8% of the transfers, and approximately 9% chose a California independent college/university or an out-of-state school.

More than one-fifth of those continuing their education were doing so at a California community college: at least 16.5% were enrolled in a Los Rios college, while 5% had transferred to another two-year school.

Table 20
TRANSFER COLLEGES
Item C-1-A

	District Totals			
TRANSFER COLLEGE	GE GRAD N=437	OE GRAD N=142	NRS N=147	Total N=726
American River College	2.1%	14.8%	10.9%	6.3%
Cosumnes River College	1.4%	3.5%	12.2%	4.0%
Sacramento City College	2.7%	8.5%	14.3%	6.2%
Other Calif. Community Colleges	1.4%	9.9%	10.9%	5.0%
CSU, Sacramento	66.4%	40.1%	29.9%	53.9%
Other CSU Campuses	8.2%	7.7%	6.1%	7.7%
UC Davis	7.3%	2.1%	2.0%	5.2%
Other UC Campuses	3.2%	0.0%	2.7%	2.5%
Calif. Independent Colleges	4.6%	9.9%	8.2%	6.3%
Colleges Outside California	2.7%	3.5%	2.7%	2.9%

The actual number attending Los Rios colleges was probably greater than indicated in Table 20. The instructions at the beginning of Section C were apparently unclear, since some respondents answered even if they were attending the same Los Rios college, while others began to answer and then stopped. It is recommended that the wording of the questionnaire for the next survey be revised to correct this ambiguity.

Transfer Majors

Respondents were also asked to indicate their major at the school to which they had transferred, and their responses are shown in Table 21. The responses were categorized according to the list of major interest fields used on the Los Rios application for admission form (also used for summarizing the community college majors shown in Table 4, page 11) so that future crosstabulations and/or comparisons with the district data base could be made if desired.

As indicated in Table 21, more than one-fourth of the total respondents were in majors related to Business Administration or Office Management. The percentages pursuing this major were quite similar among the three groups (ranging from 22.5% for OE GRADs to 26.1% for GE GRADs). For other majors, there were wide variations: 17% of the GE GRADs but only 4% of the NRSs were in Social and Behavioral Sciences; 10.6% of the OE GRADs but only 2.5% of the GE GRADs chose Protective/Social Services. The fields of Communications/Journalism, Computer/Information Sciences, Education/Physical Education, and Engineering each accounted for around 5% of the total, and slightly more than 8% were still undecided as to their major. No other major interest field attracted more than 4.0% of the total respondents.

Table 21
TRANSFER MAJORS
Item C-1-B

	District Totals			
TRANSFER MAJOR	GE GRAD N=437	OE GRAD N=142	NRS N=147	Total N=726
Agriculture/Natural Resources	.2%	3.5%	4.1%	1.7%
Architecture/Env. Design	.5%	0.0%	2.0%	.7%
Biological Sciences	4.3%	0.0%	1.4%	2.9%
Business Mgt./Office Adm.	26.1%	22.5%	24.5%	25.1%
Communications/Journalism	5.3%	4.2%	7.5%	5.5%
Computer and Information Sciences	3.7%	6.3%	5.4%	4.5%
Education/Physical Education	6.2%	5.6%	7.5%	6.3%
Engineering	4.8%	6.3%	4.8%	5.1%
English/Speech/Philosophy	3.4%	.7%	0.0%	2.2%
Fine and Applied Arts	4.8%	2.8%	2.7%	4.0%
Foreign Languages	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
Gen. Education/Interdisciplinary	1.4%	7.7%	4.8%	3.3%
Health/Allied Health Professions	4.3%	4.9%	2.0%	4.0%
Home Econ./Family Cons. Science	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
Law/Legal Assisting	.5%	.7%	.7%	.6%
Mathematics	1.4%	1.4%	.7%	1.2%
Occupational Trades/Technologies	.5%	5.6%	10.9%	3.6%
Physical Sciences	2.3%	0.0%	.7%	1.5%
Protective/Social Services	2.5%	10.6%	7.5%	5.1%
Social/Behavioral Sciences	17.2%	7.7%	4.1%	12.7%
Undecided	8.0%	9.2%	8.8%	8.4%

Problems in Transferring to Another College

Respondents were asked whether they had experienced any difficulties in transferring to another school and if so, what kinds of problems they had (Table 22).

Table 22
PROBLEMS IN TRANSFERRING TO ANOTHER COLLEGE
Item C-2

	District Totals			
TRANSFER PROBLEM?	GE GRAD N=441	OE GRAD N=139	NRS N=185	Total N=765
No Problem	88.2%	89.9%	91.4%	89.3%
Yes, Some Problem	11.8%	10.1%	8.6%	10.7%
TYPE OF PROBLEM (if "Yes"):	N=52	N=14	N=16	N=82
Transferring Units	40.0%	57.1%	30.0%	40.4%
Transcript Problems	43.6%	28.6%	45.0%	41.6%
Admission Problems	3.6%	7.1%	5.0%	4.5%
Other	12.7%	7.1%	20.0%	13.5%

Almost 90% of all respondents indicated they had made the transfer without difficulty, and percentages of each group reporting any problems were very similar.

The percentages regarding the type of problem encountered were computed only for the approximately 10% who answered "yes" to the first question. For these respondents, "transferring units" and "transcript problems" each represented approximately 40% of the difficulties. Fewer than 5% reported any problems regarding admission to the new school.

Units Accepted at Transfer College

The questionnaire also asked how many units earned at the Los Rios college had not been accepted by the transfer institution. As indicated in Table 23 on the next page, almost 39% of those responding had all units accepted, and more than 65% "lost" no more than the equivalent of two three-unit courses. Of particular interest is the fact that among the three groups, the NRSs who transferred reported the least difficulty in this area (more than 77% "lost" zero to six units).

The OE GRADs had relatively more difficulty in transferring units, but this is not surprising since most community college occupational majors require the completion of a substantial number of program-specific courses not designed to transfer to a university. The fact that most of the OE GRADs did not perceive this as a problem seems to indicate that they took the courses through choice and had a good understanding of their relationship to a four-year university program.

Table 23
UNITS ACCEPTED AT TRANSFER COLLEGE
Item C-3

UNITS ACCEPTED/LOST	District Totals GE GRAD N=426	OE GRAD N=119	NRS N=143	Total N=688
All Units Accepted	30.3%	37.8%	64.3%	38.7%
Lost 1-3 Units	18.8%	9.2%	4.9%	14.2%
Lost 4-6 Units	15.3%	6.7%	8.4%	12.4%
Lost 7-12 Units	20.2%	10.9%	10.5%	16.6%
Lost 13-21 Units	11.7%	16.0%	3.5%	10.8%
Lost 22 or More Units	3.8%	19.3%	8.4%	7.4%

Status and Classification at Present College

Of respondents enrolled in college at the time of this survey, 73% of the GE GRADs and 48% of the other two groups were enrolled full-time (Table 24). The majority of transfer students (60%) were classified as juniors at their new college, and 23% were seniors. Among those classified as freshmen or sophomores, the relatively higher percentages of OE GRADs (as compared to GE GRADs) suggest that the OE GRADs may have chosen to complete an occupational program (including some courses not designed for transfer) to acquire employment skills before going on to a university.

Table 24
STATUS/CLASSIFICATION AT PRESENT COLLEGE
Item C-4

STATUS	District Totals GE GRAD N=399	OE GRAD N=125	NRS N=125	Total N=649
Part-time (Fewer than 12 units)	26.6%	52.0%	52.0%	36.4%
Full-time (12 or more units)	73.4%	48.0%	48.0%	63.6%
CLASSIFICATION	**GE GRAD N=400**	**OE GRAD N=114**	**NRS N=105**	**Total N=619**
Freshman	.5%	1.8%	6.7%	1.8%
Sophomore	3.8%	16.7%	13.3%	7.8%
Junior	68.5%	55.3%	32.4%	59.9%
Senior	25.0%	16.7%	22.9%	23.1%
Graduate Student	2.3%	9.6%	24.8%	7.4%

It is interesting to note that almost 25% of the NRSs had attained graduate standing. Since these students had been in attendance at a Los Rios college in 1982-83 and this survey was conducted in Spring 1984, it

seems apparent that many of them had acquired more than 60 units (including some upper division credits) before transferring. These data are consistent with findings reported previously regarding the number of "reverse transfer" students in the Los Rios District (Renkiewicz, 1982).

Rating of Preparation for Continuing Education

Previous questions had asked respondents to evaluate their educational experience in general (Table 11, page 17) and the occupational training they received (Table 18, page 21). Table 25 shows their ratings of courses completed as preparation for continuing their education.

Table 25
RATING OF PREPARATION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
Item C-5
Ratings: 5 = Excellent . . . 1 = Inadequate

	District Totals			
EVALUATION OF PREPARATION	GE GRAD N=446	OE GRAD N=152	NRS N=174	Total N=772
Preparation Was Excellent	28.5%	27.6%	17.2%	25.8%
Preparation Was Satisfactory	44.2%	50.0%	44.3%	45.3%
Good in Some Areas Only	21.5%	19.1%	30.5%	23.1%
Fair; All Could Have Been Better	3.8%	2.0%	5.7%	3.9%
My Preparation Was Inadequate	2.0%	1.3%	2.3%	1.9%
AVERAGE RATING	3.93	4.01	3.68	3.89

More than 70% of the respondents rated their preparation for further education Satisfactory or Excellent. Graduates gave somewhat higher ratings than did NRSs, and it is interesting to note that the highest ratings were given by the OE GRADs who might have been expected to seek employment rather than transferring to a university.

SECTION D: FUTURE PLANS

All respondents were asked to complete the last section of the survey form, which asked the number of units the former students had completed and elicited information regarding their future plans. Their responses are shown in Tables 26 through 28 below.

Units Completed at Los Rios College

Responses to the first question in this section, "Approximately how many units have you completed at our college?" are shown in Table 26 on the next page. These data do not necessarily reflect total units completed by the respondents, since units earned at other colleges (even within the Los Rios District) are not included in this table.

Table 26
UNITS COMPLETED AT LOS RIOS COLLEGE
Item D-1

UNITS COMPLETED	District Totals GE GRAD N=642	OE GRAD N=647	NRS N=604	Total N=1,893
None	.3%	0.0%	1.0%	.4%
½ -15	1.6%	1.2%	38.9%	13.4%
16-29½	5.8%	6.8%	19.9%	10.6%
30-45½	7.3%	15.3%	11.6%	11.4%
46-59½	9.5%	7.1%	7.6%	8.1%
60 or More	75.5%	69.6%	21.0%	56.1%

Among graduates, 70% to 75% had completed 60 or more units at the Los Rios college conducting the survey, and another 16% to 22% had completed 30 or more units there.

While 21% of the NRSs reported they had completed 60 or more units (even though they had received no formal award), almost 40% had completed fewer than 16 units at that college. This latter statistic is not surprising when it is compared with the data in Table 7 (page 13) in which almost 53% of the NRSs indicated that their educational objective required only completion of selected courses or that they had enrolled for reasons other than a degree or certificate.

Relationship of Courses Completed to Career Plans

When asked "How do you see the course(s) completed at our college in terms of your career plans?" more than 78% of all respondents indicated the courses would be of direct benefit, and another 18.7% felt they would be of indirect benefit (Table 27). These figures are particularly interesting when compared with those in Table 5 (page 12) which indicated that more than 12% of NRSs and 4% of all GRADs had enrolled primarily for personal interest rather than for career-related reasons.

Table 27
RELATIONSHIP OF COURSE(S) COMPLETED TO CAREER PLANS
Item D-2

DEGREE OF BENEFIT	District Totals GE GRAD N=644	OE GRAD N=655	NRS N=610	Total N=1,909
Of Immediate, Direct Benefit	22.2%	48.9%	36.7%	36.0%
Of Long Term, Direct Benefit	49.7%	38.5%	39.2%	42.5%
Of Indirect Benefit	27.2%	10.2%	18.9%	18.7%
Of No Benefit	.9%	2.4%	5.2%	2.8%

Interest in Additional Courses

Respondents were also asked whether they were interested in taking additional courses at the college conducting the survey, and to identify the courses of interest to them. As shown in Table 28, more than 62% of the total responding indicated they would like to take additional courses in the future. Of particular interest is the fact that from 58% to 62% of the GRADs answered affirmatively, even though they had already completed an associate degree or certificate.

Table 28
INTEREST IN ADDITIONAL COURSES
Item D-3

	District Totals			
PLAN TO TAKE COURSES	GE GRAD N=613	OE GRAD N=637	NRS N=578	Total N=1,828
Yes	58.4%	62.3%	66.1%	62.2%
No	41.6%	37.7%	33.9%	37.8%

General Comments

The last item on the survey invited comments regarding how college courses and services could be improved, and many respondents took the time to offer their suggestions.

While neither the names of the desired courses nor the general comments were keyed for computer analysis, they may be summarized for internal use as fiscal resources permit. Meanwhile, the questionnaires may be inspected in the office of the Associate Dean of Occupational Education at each college in the district.

1984 AND 1983 SURVEYS COMPARED

Student follow-up procedures in the Los Rios District were expanded in 1983 and further enhanced in 1984 primarily to gather information that could be useful in eductional planning, in addition to the data required for Vocational Eduation Data System (VEDS) reports. Although more data, gathered over a longer period of time, would be desirable to identify definite trends, a comparison of the 1983 and 1984 studies can suggest directions for further research.

Several definitional distinctions are important when comparing the 1983 follow-up of occupational students with the 1984 follow-up survey:

- The terms "VEDS GRADs," "1983 GRADs," and "1984 OE GRADs," while similar, are not precisely synonymous.

- Survey population totals and response rates are computed on the basis of mailing lists generated according to VEDS guidelines. Since the 1983 survey included only persons identified by VEDS, the non-VEDS portion of the 1984 survey population was deleted and figures were recomputed for the comparisons discussed here.

- Responses to the 1983 survey were reported for GRADs and NRSs. The GRADs were considered "occupational" for VEDS reporting purposes, but were found to include some (perhaps 20%) general education/liberal arts majors as well.

- Responses to the 1984 survey are reported for GE GRADs, OE GRADs and NRSs. They were categorized by the degree or certificate they actually received; thus, the 1984 OE GRADs are exclusively occupational. General education/liberal arts majors (GE GRADs) are omitted from the comparisons in this section.

- GRADs, in these comparisons, include certificate earners as well.

- Since NRSs were identified by the same guidelines in both years, the 1983 and 1984 groups can be considered directly comparable.

Because of the slight difference in the composition of the groups, responses from the 1984 OE GRADs could be expected to be somewhat more occupationally oriented than those of the 1983 GRADs. With this caveat, some findings of the two studies are compared and discussed in the following paragraphs.

Survey Populations

- While the total survey populations for the two years differed by only 15 (2700 in 1983 and 2715 in 1984), there was a distinct shift in completion status: there were 216 fewer VEDS GRADs and 231 more NRSs in 1984 than in 1983.

Adjusted Response Rates

- Adjusted response rates for VEDS GRADs dropped from 62.0% in 1983 to 57.3% in 1984, possibly due in part to the fact that former ARC VEDS students received similar questionnaires at about the same time from another follow-up study (Brooks, 1984). Response rates for NRSs increased slightly, from 43.4% in 1983 to 44.2% in 1984.

Survey Instruments

- The questionnaire used for the 1984 survey was developed as a composite of the two used in 1983, with minor changes being made to meet specific needs. Since most items are nearly identical, many comparisons can be drawn between the two surveys.

Survey Results

Demographic comparisons of respondents to the two surveys showed that:

- Proportionately more NRSs were female in 1984 (54%) than in 1983 (45%); the percentage of females among GRADs was approximately 51% in both years.

- Ethnic minority groups comprised a slightly larger proportion of total responses in 1984 (23%), than in 1983 (approximately 21%).

- The average age of both groups was slightly older in 1984 (OE GRADs, 31.7; NRSs, 34.2) than in 1983 (GRADs, 30.1; NRSs, 33.3).

Regarding their primary educational objective:

- In 1984, 84% of OE GRADs and 74% of NRSs attended for job-related reasons; comparable figures for 1983 were 58% and 64%. The 26% increase for graduates in 1984 may be partly due to the change in composition of the GRAD groups, as noted previously. However, the size of the increase, together with the 10% increase for NRSs, suggests a strong shift in direction on this item.

- In 1984, university transfer was the goal of 9% of OE GRADs and 11% of NRSs; in 1983, percentages were 30% and 16%, respectively. Again, the revised composition of the OE GRAD group had some impact, but 5% fewer 1984 NRSs and substantially fewer 1984 OE GRADs were university-oriented, compared to 1983.

- Personal and other reasons were listed as goals by only 7% of OE GRADs and 14% of NRSs in 1984, compared to 12% of GRADs and almost 20% of NRSs in 1983. These figures suggest that 1984 respondents had more defined goals than did those in 1983.

When NRSs were asked the amount of education required to accomplish their objective, their responses indicated that:

- More than 48% of 1984 NRSs needed only to complete specific courses; in 1983, this figure was 43%. (This item was not on the 1983 GRAD questionnaire.)

- Approximately 47% of NRSs needed a degree or certificate in 1984, down from 52% in 1983.

When NRSs were asked why they had not reenrolled,

- In 1983 almost 28% checked "completed needed courses." In 1984 17% checked this reason and another 19% checked a new option, "completed degree or certificate," indicating that 36% of 1984 NRSs had completed what they desired. (This question was not on the 1983 GRAD questionnaire.)

- "Availability of courses inadequate," a new option in 1984, was checked by 6.7% of NRSs.

- Those indicating dissatisfaction with instruction and/or course content dropped to 2.8% in 1984 as compared to 5.1% in 1983; grade problems remained the same at .5%.

- Responses reflected the fact that the option regarding finances had been made more specific in the composite questionnaire: in 1983, 6% checked "financial reasons," but in 1984 less than 1% marked "college was too expensive."

- The proportion checking "other" unspecified reasons dropped from 14% in 1983 to 8.4% in 1984, possibly reflecting the slightly expanded list of options for this item.

With regard to educational and employment status,

- In 1984, 33% of OE GRADs and 29% of NRSs were enrolled in college at the time of the survey, down from 40% and 31%, respectively, in 1983.

- More than 80% of 1984 OE GRADs were employed when they responded to the survey, up from 73% of GRADs in 1983. The proportion of NRSs who were employed when surveyed was approximately the same in both years, 79%.

- The proportion who were "unemployed but actively seeking employment" improved slightly: GRADs, down from 9.5% in 1983 to 9.0% in 1984; NRSs, from 9.0% in 1983 to 8.3% in 1984. Unemployment rates for the Greater Sacramento area were 11.8% in March 1983 and 9.9% in March 1984.

Among respondents who were employed at the time they were surveyed, it was found that:

- In 1984, 76% of employed OE GRADs were working in a field related to their major, whereas only 42% had been in that field before they enrolled--an increase of 34 percentage points. Comparable figures for 1983 GRADs were: 42% employed in a related field prior to enrollment and 69% when surveyed, for an increase of 27 percentage points. NRSs, who were more likely to have been employed in their field before enrolling, had less dramatic increases: 3.7 percentage points in 1983 and 4.1 in 1984.

- Average monthly salaries reported in the two surveys were very similar (without any adjustment for inflation), and no trend was evident with respect to length of work week.

With regard to help derived from courses completed,

- More 1984 respondents reported the courses helped them to obtain a new job (53% of OE GRADs and 29% of NRSs) as compared to 1983 (31% of GRADs and 20% of NRSs).

- Fewer 1984 respondents indicated the courses helped them perform or advance in their job (30% of OE GRADs and 42% of NRSs), as compared to 1983 (52% of GRADs and 56% of NRSs).

Among respondents who were enrolled in college when surveyed:

- The percentage of OE GRADs attending part time was 52% in 1984, as compared to 32% of the 1983 GRADs. The percentage of part-time NRSs was approximately the same in both years (52%).

- Almost 23% of the 1984 NRSs had attained senior standing and 25% were graduate students by the time of the survey; corresponding figures for 1983 were: seniors, 19% and graduate students, 17%.

Regarding the relationship of college courses completed to career plans,

- More than 87% of 1984 OE GRADs (as compared to 82% of 1983 GRADs) indicated the courses were of direct benefit. For NRSs, comparable figures were 76% in 1984 and 79% in 1983.

Asked if they planned to return for classes in the future,

- The percentage indicating they planned to do so was constant for GRADs in both years (62%) but dropped slightly for NRSs, from 70% in 1983 to 66% in 1984.

In rating courses completed, services utilized, and their college experience in general,

- Ratings given by both groups were generally well above average, and ratings for the two years showed considerable consistency.

IN CONCLUSION

The results of this survey revealed that the Los Rios Community College District is serving at least three diverse groups of students which differ from each other in their goals, priorities, and aspirations, as well as in their demographic profiles. The findings further indicate that the District is, on the whole, meeting the needs of these groups very successfully.

Alumni of American River College, Cosumnes River College, and Sacramento City College who responded to the survey reported a high degree of satisfaction with their college experience in general, and also as preparation for employment and/or for continuing their education at a four-year institution.

The procedures used in the survey made it possible to identify the respondents' major fields of study more accurately than was possible in the past, and also contributed to the achievement of a higher response rate than had been obtained in similar surveys conducted in the district prior to 1983. In addition to gathering data required for VEDS reports, the questionnaire also elicited information on a large number of other items which can be useful in future educational planning.

This study, as the second phase of a long-range plan to improve student follow-up in the Los Rios Community College District, can provide the basis for even more valuable research in future years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the experience of conducting this survey as well as the results obtained, it is recommended that the Los Rios Community College District continue the following practices with respect to student follow-up:

1. Survey all graduates, certificate earners, and a sample of nonreturning students at least biennially to gather the type of important information contained in this report.

2. Conduct the survey as a coordinated, districtwide effort using common forms and methods.

3. Send questionnaires from and have responses returned to the respective colleges; coordinate the project from the District Office; and summarize findings in one report including both district and college data.

4. In summarizing findings, identify respondents according to the major field in which their degree or certificate (if any) was actually awarded.

5. When surveying occupational education students, include all occupational programs offered in the district (rather than just those for which VEDS reports are required in a given year).

6. Analyze the responses within the district, using SPSS-X.

It is further recommended that procedures be developed or expanded to:

1. Disseminate the survey results to appropriate persons or agencies within the district and at local and state levels.

2. Utilize the survey results as appropriate to enhance the programs and services offered by the colleges of the district.

3. Conduct further SPSS-X analysis of the data gathered in this survey (e.g., explore interrelationships among data elements; generate printouts for major programs which have a sufficient number of responses; etc.).

4. Summarize the comments made by respondents to the 1984 and 1983 follow-up surveys and disseminate the results to appropriate college staff (this has not been done previously due to lack of staff time).

5. Increase faculty/staff involvement in the student follow-up process so that the findings will be of greater significance to them.

6. Publicize the follow-up more widely among currently enrolled students and among area residents, in an effort to increase the response rates in future surveys.

7. Tally VEDS data using SPSS-X, relieving the clerical staff at each college of the onerous task of tallying it "by hand."

8. Reword the instructions for Section C of the questionnaire to remove the ambiguity discussed on page 22 of this report.

9. Consider using the employer information obtained through this survey in future follow-up of employers and/or in conjunction with the District's Regional Employment and Training Needs Assessment Project (RETNA) (Coffey, 1984).

REFERENCES

Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.

Brooks, Walter L. Student and Employer Follow-Up: An Assessment of California Community Colleges' Ability to Comply with Vocational Education Data System Requirements. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1982.

_____. Using Student Performance in Planning (Executive Summary). Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1984.

Coffey, Janis Cox. Planning for Change: Fall 1984 Enrollment Update. Sacramento, CA: Los Rios Community College District Office of Planning and Research. 1984.

_____. RETNA: Regional Employment and Training Needs Project. Los Rios Community College District Office of Planning and Research. 1984.

_____, and Randall D. Jones. RETNA: Regional Employment and Training Needs Assessment Project, Fall 1984 Update. Los Rios Community College District Office of Planning and Research. 1984.

DeVault, Mike, and Marilyn Lee. Texas Student Information System Graduate/Completer 1977 Sub-System: A Follow-Up Study. Austin: Department of Occupational Education and Technology, Texas Education Agency. 1978.

Gray, Robert J., and others. Student-Outcomes Questionnaires: An Implementation Handbook. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. 1979.

Hall, Toni, and Jim Reed. Nonreturning Students Data Summary--1976-77. Tex-SIS Follow-Up: Postsecondary Student Follow-Up Management Information System, Monograph 10. Austin: Texas Education Agency. 1979.

Lee, Beth S. Follow-up of Occupational Education Students, Los Rios Community College District, Spring 1983. Sacramento, CA: Los Rios Community College District. 1984.

Los Angeles Community College District. The Fall 1980 Student Survey. Office of Educational Planning and Resource Development, Los Angeles Community College District. 1980.

Morris, William. Student Accountability Model (SAM) Operations Manual. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1981.

Rasor, Richard A. Why Students Drop Classes and Withdraw from American River College. Sacramento: Office of Research and Development, American River College. 1980.

_____. The Opinions and Goals of Current ARC Students. Sacramento: Office of Research and Development, American River College. 1982.

_____, and Jeannie McGill. Follow-up of American River College 1977 Alumni. Sacramento: Office of Research and Development, American River College. 1981.

Renkiewicz, Nancy K., and others. The Reverse Transfer Student: An Emerging Population. Sacramento: Los Rios Community College District and Northern California Cooperative Institutional Research Group. 1982.

Sheldon, M. Stephen. Guest Editorial, The News of the California Association of Community Colleges, January 1983, p. 4.

_____. Statewide Longitudinal Study: 1978-1981 Final Report. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. 1982.

_____, and Clive L. Grafton. "Everything you always wanted to know about California community college students...and thought you already did." California Higher Education, November 1982, pp. 14-16.

Slark, Julie. Longitudinal Study of Student Flow. Santa Ana, CA: Institutional Research Office, Santa Ana College. 1979.

Southern Regional Education Board. Follow-Up Surveys of College Graduates: Procedures and Common Core of Questions, Two-Year Institutions. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board. 1978.

U. S. Office of Education. Survey of 1976-77 Graduates, Hawaii Community Colleges. Student Flow Project, Report No. 35. Washington: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1978.

Williams, William G. and Fred A. Snyder. Follow-Up Studies of Former Occupational-Technical Students at Community Colleges. Richmond: Virginia Department of Community Colleges. 1974.

APPENDIX

LRCCD84/LEE

FOR COLLEGE USE ONLY

Los Rios Community College District

College Code 23 24 25 26 | Date Mo 28 29 Yr 32 33

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE
4700 College Oak Drive
Sacramento, CA 95841

Completion Code 35 | TOP Code 37 38 39 40 41 42

Major Code 44 45 46 47 | Target Pop. Code 51 HNCP 52 LEP 53 DAVT 54 | Special Code 55

PROJECT FOLLOW-UP

Please make corrections to the information above if necessary.

Note: This report is authorized by law (20 USC 2312 and 20 USC 2381). While you are not required to respond to this survey, your cooperation is needed to insure that the results of this effort are comprehensive, reliable and timely.

PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BLOCK(S) WITHIN EACH CATEGORY BELOW

SECTION A EVERYONE SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION

Please respond below as appropriate. This information is needed for equal opportunity education and employment reporting.

Major _____ (at our college)

SEX (70)
1 Male
2 Female

ETHNIC GROUP (71)
1 American Indian or Alaskan Native
2 Asian or Pacific Islander
4 Black, not of Hispanic origin
3 Filipino
5 Hispanic
6 White, not of Hispanic origin
7 Nonresident Alien

AGE GROUP (72)
1 16-19
2 20-24
3 25-29
4 30-34
5 35-44
6 45-54
7 55-64
8 65 or +

1 What was your PRIMARY objective in attending our college? (73)
1 Improvement of existing "job skills"
2 Preparation for "job to be obtained"
3 University transfer credit
4 Personal interest
5 Other (describe) _____

2 To what extent has this objective been completed? (48)
1 Fully completed
2 Partially completed
3 Not completed

3 Do you plan to pursue this objective further? (49)
1 Yes: Where? (50)
1 At our college
2 At another two-year college
3 At a four-year university
4 Other (describe) _____
2 No

4 How much education is (or was) required to accomplish your educational objective at our college? (Check one) (51)
1 Selected course(s)
2 Certificate program
3 Two-year associate degree program
4 Other (describe) _____

5 What was your PRIMARY reason for not reenrolling at our college this semester? (Check only most important reason.)
56 Completed associate degree or certificate
57 Completed desired courses
58 Transferred to another college
59 Found or seeking employment
60 Job hours conflict with school
61 Moved out of area / Transportation problems
62 College was too expensive
63 Availability of courses inadequate
64 Grade problems
65 Dissatisfied with quality of instruction
66 Dissatisfied with content of courses
67 Personal/family reasons not listed above
68 Other (describe) _____

6 What is your current EDUCATIONAL STATUS? (Check one) (71)
1 Currently attending school
2 Not currently attending school

7 What is your current EMPLOYMENT STATUS? (Check one) (72)
1 Employed (Includes all employment, even if below your qualifications; does not include full-time military service)
2 Employed (Full-time military service)
3 Unemployed (Not employed, but actively seeking employment)
4 Not in labor force (Not employed and not seeking employment because of choice, illness, full-time student status, retirement, pregnancy, or other such reason)

8 Please rate COURSES COMPLETED IN YOUR MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY as to how well they fulfilled your individual needs. Students with "undecided/undeclared" majors should skip to Question 9.

		Very Good 5	Good 4	Ave. 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1
a. Quality of instruction	74					
b. Grading/Testing	75					
c. Instructor interest	76					
d. Content of course(s)	77					
e. Instructional media	78					
f. Class size	79					

9 IF YOU HAVE USED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING COLLEGE SERVICES, please rate them as to how well they fulfilled your individual needs.

		Very Good 5	Good 4	Ave. 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1
a. Financial aids	35					
b. Counseling/advisement	36					
c. Job placement services	37					
d. Assessment center	38					
e. Tutoring services	39					
f. Learning center/labs	40					
g. Student activities	41					
h. Library services	42					
i. Health center	43					
j. Services for disabled	44					
k. Veterans services	45					

10 Which statement best describes your feeling about your educational experience at our college? (46)
5 Very satisfied
4 Satisfied
3 Average
2 Disappointed
1 Very disappointed

OVER PLEASE!

SPACE BELOW RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

SECTION B

IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY EMPLOYED OR IN FULL-TIME MILITARY SERVICE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION C.

1 Please provide the following information on your present job.

Name of Company or Firm (If self-employed, please write self.)

Company or Firm Mailing Address

City State (48-52) Zip Code

Your Job Title

Your Job Duties

We periodically survey employers to help us evaluate our courses and advise us on other courses or programs which are needed. If we may contact your immediate supervisor for such a survey, please indicate:

Supervisor's Last Name First Name M.I.

Supervisor's Job Title

2 Is this job related to the courses you have completed at our college?

53 1 Yes, it is directly or closely related
2 No, it is only remotely related or not related at all

3 If your occupational area is NOT related to the courses you have completed at our college, please check each reason which applies. If occupational area is related to courses completed, go to Question 5.

54 Transferred to a four-year college
55 Not sufficiently qualified for job in field of preparation
56 Preferred to work in another field
57 Found better paying job in another field
58 Could not find a job in field of preparation
59 Worked previously in field of preparation, but changed
60 Other (describe)

4 What is your current salary (gross)? (Do not add in overtime.) This information, when combined with that from others in your field of study, will provide valuable help to others in their career planning.

(Check one)

$ PER 1 HOUR 2 WEEK 3 MONTH 4 YEAR
62-68 (70)

5 The salary in the preceding item is based on how many hours per week employment?

Hours per week
(71-72)

6 Were you employed in your occupational area PRIOR to enrolling in the course(s) completed at our college?

74 1 Yes
2 No

7 How would you rate the training you received at our college in relation to its usefulness to you in performing your job?

75 5 Very good
4 Good
3 Average
2 Poor
1 Very poor

8 Please check below if the course(s) you took at our college helped you in your occupational area in any of the following ways.

76 Helped to obtain job
77 Helped performance on present job
78 Helped advance on present job
79 None of the above
80 Other (describe)

SECTION C

IF YOU HAVE ENROLLED IN COLLEGE SINCE LEAVING OUR COLLEGE, PLEASE ANSWER THIS SECTION. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO SECTION D.

1 Please respond below regarding your current (or most recently attended) college.

Name of College

City and State

Major Field of Study (at college indicated above)

36 38 37 39 TC (College use only) TM 40 41 42 43

2 Did you have problems transferring to the college indicated above?

45 1 Yes. What? »
2 No

46 Transferring units
47 Transcript problems
48 Admission problems
49 Other (describe)

3 How many units earned at our college were not accepted at the college indicated above?

51 1 All units accepted
2 Lost 1-3 units
3 Lost 4-6 units
4 Lost 7-12 units
5 Lost 13-21 units
6 Lost more than 21 units

4 If you are currently enrolled in college, please indicate your current status and classification at the college indicated above.

STATUS
53 1 Part-time Student (Fewer than 12 units)
2 Full-time Student (12 or more units)

CLASSIFICATION
54 1 Freshman
2 Sophomore
3 Junior
4 Senior
5 Graduate Student

5 How well did the courses you completed at our college prepare you for continuing your education?

56 6 Preparation was excellent
4 Preparation was satisfactory
3 Good in some areas only
2 Fair; all areas could have been better
1 Preparation was inadequate

SECTION D

EVERYONE SHOULD ANSWER THIS SECTION.

1 Approximately how many units have you completed at our college?

UNITS
60 1 None
2 ½ - 15½
3 16 - 29½
4 30-45½
5 46 - 59½
6 60 or more

2 How do you see the course(s) completed at our college in terms of your career plans?

62 Of immediate, direct benefit
63 Of long term, direct benefit
64 Of indirect benefit
65 Of no benefit

3 Are you interested in taking other courses at our college? You may include courses not presently offered by our college.

67 1 Yes What courses?
2 No

4 We would appreciate any comments regarding how we could improve the course(s) you have completed and/or services we have provided. Please use the space below (front and back) for your comments.

SPACE BELOW RESERVED FOR COMMENTS

LRCCD84/LEE

(Use reverse side for additional space)

THANK YOU FOR ASSISTING US IN OUR SURVEY! PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM IN THE PREPAID ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

COVER LETTER, FIRST MAILING

(Reproduced on College Letterhead)

April 10, 1984

Hello:

_____ _____ College needs your help! As a former student, you can provide important information that will help us improve our service to the community.

We would like to know how satisfied you were with your experiences here and what your educational needs are for the future. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the prepaid envelope within ten days.

The data you and others provide will be summarized to help us improve our programs and services, but your individual responses will be held in strict confidence.

Your participation in this survey is important. By responding promptly, you may be helping your children, a friend or neighbor, or perhaps yourself, if you attend __C in the future.

If you have questions about the survey, give us a call at ___-____. Meanwhile, thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

President

Dean of Occupational Education
(or Instruction)

Enclosures

COVER LETTER, SECOND MAILING

(Reproduced on College Letterhead)

April 30, 1984

Hello!

Recently we sent you a PROJECT FOLLOW-UP survey form and asked that you complete and return it. We have not yet received your reply.

Your response is important. We want the survey results to reflect the opinions of all our former students, so we would like to hear from you. Please help us by taking a few minutes now to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the postpaid envelope. Your answers will be held in confidence, and only summarized information will be reported.

This is your opportunity to help _____ _____ College evaluate and improve its programs and services. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Please respond today!

Sincerely,

President

Dean of Occupational Education
(or Instruction)

Enclosures

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

	*ARC	CRC	SCC	District
VEDS GRADs				
Forms Mailed	553	118	363	1,034
Forms Undelivered by P.O.	-28	- 5	-55	- 88
Net Delivered Forms	525	113	308	946
Responses	285	72	185	542
Adjusted Response Rate	54.3%	63.7%	60.1%	57.3%
NRSs				
Forms Mailed	826	401	454	1,681
Forms Undelivered by P.O.	-57	-22	-65	-144
Net Delivered Forms	769	379	389	1,537
Responses	333	177	169	679
Adjusted Response Rate	43.3%	46.7%	43.4%	44.2%
TOTAL VEDS RESPONSES				
Forms Mailed	1,379	519	817	2,715
Forms Undelivered by P.O.	-85	-27	-120	-232
Net Delivered Forms	1,294	492	697	2,483
Responses	618	249	354	1,221
Adjusted Response Rate	47.8%	50.6%	50.8%	49.2%
Non-VEDS GRADs				
Forms Mailed	877	175	513	1,565
Forms Undelivered by P.O.	-37	- 8	-43	- 88
Net Delivered Forms	840	167	470	1,477
Responses	473	94	254	821
Adjusted Response Rate	56.3%	56.3%	54.0%	55.6%
Combined Totals				
Forms Mailed	2,256	694	1,330	4,280
Total Undelivered	-122	-35	-163	-320
Net Delivered Forms	2,134	659	1,167	3,960
Percent Undelivered	5.4%	5.0%	12.3%	7.5%
Responses	1,091	343	608	2,042
Adjusted Response Rate	51.1%	52.0%	52.1%	51.6%

*Former ARC VEDS students also received somewhat similar questionnaires at about the same time from another follow-up study (Brooks, 1984).

DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS

	Spring 1984 Survey		Fall 1982
	Population	Responses	Enrollment
GENDER			
*Male	51.6%	44.2%	45.3%
Female	48.4%	55.8%	54.7%
ETHNICITY			
Am.Indian/Alaskan	1.5%	2.0%	1.4%
Asian/Filipino	8.4%	9.8%	7.3%
Black	8.4%	5.6%	10.7%
Hispanic	6.0%	5.6%	6.9%
*White	75.7%	76.7%	65.4%
*Not Coded	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%
Non-resident Alien	0.0%	.2%	2.2%
AGE GROUPS			
16-24	**	32.9%	51.8%
25-29	**	19.1%	18.1%
30 or Older	**	43.0%	30.1%
Not Coded	**	5.0%	0.0%

*With respect to sex and ethnicity, the computer program which was used to generate the survey population mailing list defaulted nonresponses into "male" and "white," giving these two categories somewhat higher percentages than would otherwise be the case. In the Fall 1982 Student Characteristics Report, nonresponses were recorded as "Not Coded."

**No age breakdowns were available for the survey population.

AWARDS GRANTED/SURVEY RESPONSES
BY COMMUNITY COLLEGE MAJOR

s:
lajors are listed under the Major Interest Fields used on the LRCCD Application for Admission form.
elated majors in each field are grouped together and thus are not in strict alpha order.
wards include both degrees and certificates granted, Fall 1982-Spring 1983 (not summer session).
RAD Responses include those from both graduates and certificate earners.

nd: - = Major is not offered at that college; 0 = Major is offered, but no degrees/responses.

OS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	LRCCD Code	Awards Granted			GRAD Responses			NRS Responses			Total Responses		
		ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC
CULTURE/NATURAL RESOURCES													
culture-Agri. Business	133	-	4	-	-	4	-	-	7	-	-	11	-
culture-Animal Science	130	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-
al Health Technology	120	-	22	-	-	12	-	-	9	-	-	21	-
stry Technician	117	3	-	-	3	-	-	1	-	-	4	-	-
scape Industry	115	8	-	-	6	-	-	3	-	-	9	-	-
ery Industry	116	6	-	-	4	-	-	0	-	-	4	-	-
oor Rec./Wildlife Tech	118	0	-	0	0	-	0	1	-	0	1	-	0
ITECTURE/ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN													
Design-Architecture	670	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	11	-	-	14	-
Design-Construction	671	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-
Design-Design Drafting	672	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
Design-Solar & Alt. Energy	669	-	9	-	-	8	-	-	4	-	-	12	-
NESS/MANAGEMENT/OFFICE ADMINISTRATION													
unting	220	-	11	15	-	4	7	-	56	12	-	60	19
unting Technician	219	24	-	-	16	-	-	21	-	-	37	-	-
n. Housekeeping Mgmt	228	27	-	-	9	-	-	2	-	-	11	-	-
rtising	221	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1
rtising & Sales	233	3	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	2	-	-
ing and Finance	203	3	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	2	-	-
it & Lending	205	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	LRCCD Code	Awards Granted			GRAD Responses			NRS Responses			Total Respons		
		ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SC
BUSINESS/MGT./OFFICE ADMIN. (Cont.)													
Bookkeeping	222	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	
Business Administration	200	-	8	45	-	3	29	-	0	6	-	3	3
General Business	210	149	7	118	72	2	59	16	2	8	88	4	6
General Business-Accountin	280	-	5	-	-	4	-	-	0	-	-	4	
Gen Business-Management	282	-	7	-	-	3	-	-	0	-	-	3	
Gen Business-Marketing	284	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	
Food Service Mgmt-Restaurant	790	8	-	-	4	-	-	5	-	-	9	-	
Dietetic Assistant	793	7	-	-	5	-	-	0	-	-	5	-	
Charter Life Underwriter	211	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Property-Casualty Insurance	213	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Management-General	223	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	2	-	-	
Management-Business	224	59	-	-	32	-	-	9	-	-	41	-	
Management-Government	226	25	-	-	15	-	-	0	-	-	15	-	
Management-Industrial	227	11	-	-	5	-	-	0	-	-	5	-	
Management-Org. Logistics	229	6	-	-	4	-	-	0	-	-	4	-	
Marketing	235	2	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	
Merchandising	218	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	
Retail Merchandising Mgmt	230	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	
General Office Training	243	3	0	-	1	0	-	2	0	-	3	0	
Office Admin-Secretarial	236	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	4	-	-	6	
Office Admin-Word Processing	237	-	7	0	-	5	0	-	0	0	-	5	
Secretarial Training	240	6	1	2	3	1	1	16	0	3	19	1	
Legal Secretary	242	8	-	0	6	-	0	2	-	0	8	-	
Medical Secretary	241	1	-	1	1	-	0	0	-	0	1	-	
Real Estate	250	18	-	0	9	-	0	12	-	3	21	-	
Small Business Operation	225	4	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	6	-	
Transportation	830	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	
COMMUNICATIONS/JOURNALISM													
Comm Media-Broad Journalism	271	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	4	
Comm Media-Photography	272	-	2	1	-	1	0	-	4	0	-	5	
Comm Media-Radio Production	273	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	
Comm Telev Production	274	-	11	-	-	5	-	-	14	-	-	19	
Community Journalism	534	3	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	2	-	

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	LRCCD Code	Awards Granted			GRAD Responses			NRS Responses			Total Respons		
		ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SC
OMPUTER/INFORMATION SCIENCE													
ata Processing	260	52	3	18	30	2	9	13	0	13	43	2	2
DUCATION/PHYSICAL EDUCATION													
ecreation/Leisure Leadership	430	7	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	6	-	
hysical Education	420	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	
GLISH/SPEECH/PHILOSOPHY (HUMANITIES)													
eneral Humanities	506	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	
anguage & Literature	531	10	-	24	7	-	12	1	-	0	8	-	1
INE AND APPLIED ARTS													
rt	520	15	1	15	11	1	7	0	0	1	11	1	
eneral Fine Arts	505	-	-	14	-	-	3	-	-	0	-	-	
raphic Arts	523	-	2	6	-	2	5	-	0	8	-	2	1
ustom Clothing Construction	558	3	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	
ashion Merchandising	231	4	-	-	2	-	-	6	-	-	8	-	
nterior Design	567	17	-	-	9	-	-	3	-	-	12	-	
usic	580	3	1	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	3	1	
heater Arts	541	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	
ENERAL EDUCATION/INTERDISCIPLINARY													
eneral Education Program	510	289	113	6	155	62	6	11	1	1	166	63	
eneral Studies	512	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	
nterdis Studies-Humanities	054	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	2	
nterdis Studies-Women	056	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	
iberal Arts	511	41	-	-	22	-	-	0	-	-	22	-	
EALTH PROFESSIONS/ALLIED HEALTH													
ental Assisting	454	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	3	-	-	
ental Hygiene	687	-	-	8	-	-	6	-	-	12	-	-	1
edical Assisting	456	-	5	-	-	5	-	-	5	-	-	10	
ursing (RN)	452	50	-	41	30	-	29	4	-	9	34	-	3
ursing (Vocational)	453	-	-	55	-	-	23	-	-	0	-	-	2
espiratory Therapy	460	8	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	6	-	

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	LRCCD Code	Awards Granted			GRAD Responses			NRS Responses			Total Responses		
		ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC
HOME ECONOMICS/FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCE													
Early Childhood Education	564	37	2	26	19	1	14	11	0	16	30	1	30
Home Economics, Gen. Educ.	559	5	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	-	-
Home Economics	560	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1
Family and Consumer Science	557	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	3	-	-	3
LAW/LEGAL ASSISTING													
Legal Assisting	244	17	-	-	9	-	-	4	-	-	13	-	-
LIBRARY SCIENCE/LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY													
Library Technical Assistant	884	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
Library Technology	885	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1
MATHEMATICS													
Mathematics	620	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0
Math & Physical Science	622	57	-	-	38	-	-	0	-	-	38	-	-
Mathematics and Science	621	-	9	56	-	5	31	-	0	0	-	5	31
OCCUPATIONAL/TRADE TECHNOLOGIES													
Auto Mechanics Technology	802	-	11	-	-	5	-	-	20	-	-	25	-
Auto Transmission Repair	832	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-
Auto Brake/Front End Alignment	831	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
Small Engine Repair	819	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-
Auto Body	825	8	-	-	3	-	-	6	-	-	9	-	-
Automotive Technology	826	20	-	-	10	-	-	2	-	-	12	-	-
Aviation Maintenance Tech	801	-	-	78	-	-	36	-	-	2	-	-	38
Carpenters	330	1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
Construction Management	820	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	7	-	-	9	-
Construction Superv./Inspect.	813	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	-
Cosmetology	881	-	-	28	-	-	15	-	-	0	-	-	15
Diesel Equipment Mechanics	811	9	-	-	4	-	-	5	-	-	9	-	-
Detail Drafting Technology	851	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-
Drafting Technology	804	17	-	6	9	-	3	6	-	4	15	-	7

LOS RIOS COLLEGE MAJOR	LRCCD Code	Awards Granted			GRAD Responses			NRS Responses			Total Respons		
		ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SCC	ARC	CRC	SC
CUPATIONAL/TRADE TECHNOLOGIES (Cont.)													
ectronic Camera Repair Tech	800	0	-	-	0	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	
ectronics Communication Tech	807	18	-	-	9	-	-	1	-	-	10	-	
ectronics Computer Tech	806	201	-	-	83	-	-	38	-	-	121	-	
ectronics Technology	805	-	-	23	-	-	12	-	-	4	-	-	
gineering Technology	300	4	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	3	-	
e Technology	883	28	2	-	17	0	-	34	5	-	51	5	
neral Design Studies	855	-	8	-	-	5	-	-	0	-	-	5	
t Cutting	795	0	-	-	0	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	
hanical Technology	809	-	-	42	-	-	19	-	-	1	-	-	
tals Industry Technology	810	-	-	12	-	-	4	-	-	0	-	-	
erating Engineers-General	845	3	-	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	2	-	
eet Metal	317	0	-	-	0	-	-	14	-	-	14	-	
rvey Engineering	309	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	
lding-Industrial	315	11	-	-	6	-	-	11	-	-	17	-	
YSICAL SCIENCES													
tural Science and Math	600	-	-	12	-	-	4	-	-	1	-	-	
ience General	615	26	-	6	20	-	3	0	-	0	20	-	
ological Technology	643	-	2	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	
OTECTIVE AND SOCIAL SERVICES													
ministration of Justice	888	4	-	64	2	-	23	1	-	35	3	-	
man Services	705	15	-	-	8	-	-	16	-	-	24	-	
rontology	711	4	-	-	1	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	
terpreting for the Deaf	708	5	-	-	3	-	-	12	-	-	15	-	
ency Work with the Deaf	709	5	-	-	4	-	-	0	-	-	4	-	
CIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES													
cial Science	701	45	8	128	23	4	64	0	0	6	23	4	
DECLARED	030	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	21	15	26	21	
TOTALS		1430	293	876	758	166	439	333	177	169	1091	343	6
GRAND TOTALS		2,599			1,363			679			2,042		

AWARDS GRANTED COMPARED WITH MAJORS PREDICTED BY USOE CODES

The value of data obtained through follow-up of former students is directly related to the accuracy of that data. More specifically, the usefulness of follow-up information at the program level is directly related to the accuracy of the data regarding the respondents' major programs of study.

In the Los Rios Spring 1983 follow-up survey (Lee, 1984) it was assumed that students were majoring in the program associated with the highest level occupational course they had taken during their last two semesters of attendance. This was in accordance with guidelines prescribed by the Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) using Student Accountability Model (SAM) and U. S. Office of Education (USOE) code designations. As discussed in that report, problems within in the VEDS/SAM system diluted the value of the data when used at the program level.

For the Spring 1984 study, the computer-generated mailing list indicated the majors in which degrees and certificates (if any) had actually been granted, as well as the USOE codes required for VEDS reporting. When the majors "predicted" by the USOE codes were compared with the awards granted, it was found that:

- The "percentage of match" between predicted majors and actual majors of graduates and certificate earners ranged from 100% to zero* for the various USOE code groups.

- Among respondents to this survey, 133 (20.1%) of the GE GRADs had been erroneously identified as occupational by VEDS/SAM guidelines, and 293 (41.8%) of the OE GRADs (204 graduates and 89 certificate earners) had been omitted by those guidelines.

In the Results of the Study section of this report (pp. 8-28), responses of graduates and certificate earners were reported under their correct major program. (USOE code data were used to compile VEDS reports.)

For responding NRSs who did not indicate their major field of interest, the USOE code which had caused them to be included in the follow-up (as discussed on pages 4-5 of this report) was used to assign a major:

- If the "percentage of match" as described above was 50% or better (an arbitrary cut-off point), the NRS was assumed to be majoring in the program associated with that USOE code.

- If the "percentage of match" was less than 50%, the NRS was considered to be "undecided" with respect to major.

*A list indicating the "percentage of match" for each USOE code was prepared; however, the use of USOE codes in VEDS reporting has now been discontinued so the data have no future use and are not included here.

62

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

JUL 19 1985

END

DEPT. OF EDUCATION

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

OCTOBER

7 - 1985